

ANGLO- SOVIET JOURNAL

CONTENTS

In Central Asia **Dr. S. M. Manton, FRS**

The Soviet Health Services **Dr. Ian Gilliland**

The Periodisation of Russian History **R. W. Davies**

Trade Union Activity in Soviet Factories **from V Pomoshch Profsoyuznomu Aktivu**

The Life and Work of Pudovkin **Ralph Parker**

AND BOOK REVIEWS, ETC.

VOLUME XII ∞ NUMBER 4

**WINTER
1951-1952**

TWO SHILLINGS & SIXPENCE

SCR

14 KENSINGTON SQUARE, LONDON, W.8. WESTERN 1571

OFFICERS, 1950-51

<i>President</i>	SIR CHARLES TREVELYAN, BT., P.C.
<i>Chairman</i>	D. N. PRITT, K.C.
<i>Hon. Treasurer</i>	A. W. L. KESSEL, M.C., M.B.E., F.R.C.S.
<i>Secretary</i>	MISS JUDITH TODD, B.A.
<i>Organiser</i>	CHRISTOPHER FREEMAN, B.Sc.(ECON.)

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE—Dudley Collard, Dr. Horace Joules, Arthur Ling, A.R.I.B.A., Miss Mary Merrall, The Hon. Ivor Montagu, Prof. L. S. Penrose, D. T. Richnell, Gordon Sandison, Cdr. E. P. Young, R.N. (retd.), Prof. C. L. Wrenn.

ARCHITECTURE AND PLANNING GROUP.—*Chairman*: Arthur Ling, A.R.I.B.A., A.M.T.P.I. *Committee*: A. W. Barr, A.R.I.B.A., Bertram Carter, F.R.I.B.A., Wells Coates, O.B.E., F.R.I.B.A., Miss Elizabeth Denby, HON. A.R.I.B.A., R. I. Greatrex, A.R.I.B.A., J. Howe, A.R.I.B.A., J. D. Kay, B. Lubetkin, Colin Penn, A.R.I.B.A., John Pinkheard, A.R.I.B.A., Peter Shephard, B.A.R.C.H., A.R.I.B.A., A.M.T.P.I., Gordon Stephenson, F.R.I.B.A.

CHESS SECTION.—*President*: Prof. L. S. Penrose. *Vice-Presidents*: I. R. Vesselo, William Winter, B. H. Wood. *Council*: W. A. Fairhurst, J. Gilchrist, H. Golombek, H. M. Lommer, Kingsley Martin, Julius Silverman, M.P., Miss Eileen Tranmer.

EDUCATION SECTION.—*President*: Lady Simon of Wythenshawe. *Vice-Presidents*: Miss D. E. M. Gardner, G. D. B. Gray, Prof. M. L. Jacks, Dr. G. B. Jeffery, F.R.S., Prof. J. A. Lauwerys, Prof. V. de S. Pinto, Dr. Janet Vaughan, Dame Olive Wheeler. *Chairman*: Mrs. Beatrice King. *Committee*: *Representatives from*—The Association of Headmistresses, The Assistant Mistresses Association, The Association of Teachers in Colleges and Departments of Education, The Incorporated Association of Assistant Masters, The English New Education Fellowship, The Modern Language Association.

FILM SECTION.—*President*: Sir Laurence Olivier. *Chairman*: Roger Livesey. *Committee*: Anthony Asquith, Ralph Bond, Arthur Calder-Marshall, Basil Dearden, Sir Arthur Elton, Sidney Gilliat, Alfred Junge, Gavin Lambert, Frank Launder, Vivien Leigh, Dr. Roger Manvell, Ivor Montagu, Ronald Neame, Michael Powell, Sir Ralph Richardson, Paul Rotha, R. C. Sherriff, Harry Watt, Graham Woodford, Basil Wright.

LEGAL SECTION.—*Chairman*: Dudley Collard. *Hon. Sec.*: T. Whitty. *Committee*: M. Abrahams, Lord Chorley, A. Kiralfy, R. Simon, M. Wilenkin.

MUSIC ADVISORY COMMITTEE.—Alan Bush, Victor Carne, Edward Clark, Scott Goddard, Julian Herbage, Thomas Russell (London Philharmonic Orchestra), Prof. Edward Dent, Dr. John Ireland, Sir Arthur Bliss, Rutland Boughton.

SCIENCE ADVISORY COUNCIL.—Prof. J. D. Bernal, F.R.S., Prof. P. M. S. Blackett, F.R.S., Lord Boyd-Orr, F.R.S., Dr. Julian Huxley, F.R.S., Dr. Dorothy Needham, F.R.S., Prof. D. H. Smyth, Sir Robert Watson-Watt, F.R.S. *Chairman of Medical Committee*: A. W. L. Kessel, F.R.C.S.

THEATRE SECTION.—*President*: Sir Lewis Casson. *Vice-Presidents*: Peggy Ashcroft, John Burrell, Joseph Macleod, Dame Sybil Thorndike, Dame Ninette de Valois. *Hon. Treasurer*: Mary Merrall. *Committee*: Sir Kenneth Barnes, Peter Brook, Lawrance Collingwood, C.B.E., Peter Copley, George Devine, Rachel Kempson, Martin Lawrence, Beatrix Lehmann, Margaret Leighton, Miles Malleon, Herbert Marshall, Oscar Quitak, Michael Redgrave, Llewellyn Rees, John Ruddock, Gordon Sandison, R. D. Smith, Gwynneth L. Thurburn.

WRITERS' GROUP.—*Committee*: James Aldridge, Adrian Brunel, Mrs. Cecil Chesterton, O.B.E., Roy Fuller, Jack Lindsay, James MacGibbon, Compton Mackenzie, O.B.E., LL.D., David Magarshack, Bertha Malnick, PH.D., Iris Morley, Ernest Raymond, Montagu Slater, L. A. G. Strong, Julian Symons, Dylan Thomas, Alick West, Prof. C. L. Wrenn.

THE ANGLO-SOVIET JOURNAL

The Anglo-Soviet Journal is the quarterly organ of the Society for Cultural Relations between the Peoples of the British Commonwealth and the USSR.

The Society is a non-political organisation founded in 1924 to diffuse information in both countries on developments in science, education, art, literature, and social and economic life.

The SCR organises lectures, concerts, film shows, playreadings, exhibitions and so on, and has the largest collection of information in Britain on cultural aspects of the USSR. It carries on these activities largely through its specialised bodies, the *Architecture and Planning Group*, the *Chess Section*, the *Education Section*, the *Film Section*, the *Legal Section*, the *Music Section*, the *Science Section*, the *Theatre Section*, the *Translators' Group*, the *Writers' Group*, and a number of working committees on other subjects.

The SCR Library contains nearly 10,000 volumes in English and in Russian and is a comprehensive source of authoritative information on Soviet cultural matters, as is also the Exhibition Department as regards pictorial and display material.

Members of the SCR are entitled to borrow books from the Library and to take out subscriptions to the *Anglo-Soviet Journal* at a reduced rate; at many of the Society's functions there is a reduced admission fee for members. The basic subscription to the Society is 10s. 6d. a year (students and country members 5s.).

EDITOR *Andrew Rothstein, M.A.*
ASSISTANT EDITOR *Stella Jackson, B.A.*

Editorial Office:
14 Kensington Square, London, W.8
Telephone: WEStern 1571

The MODERN QUARTERLY

Editor: John Lewis

Vol. 7 No. 1

Winter 1951-2

CONTENTS

LUCRETII ON WAR AND
PEACE

Benjamin Farrington

TWO CAMPS IN THE WORLD
OF FILMS

John Alexander

THEORY versus EMPIRICISM
IN MEDICINE

L. Crome

MODERN PAINTING

Oscar Thomson

Reviews

LE PAYS DES MINES

James Hammond

FRANCIS BACON: PHILOSOPHER
OF INDUSTRIAL
SCIENCE

Christopher Hill

Communication

ORNAMENTAL ART

Ralph Parker

2s. 6d.

Annual Subscription, 11s.

LAWRENCE & WISHART

81 Chancery Lane
London, W.C.2

METHUEN'S RUSSIAN TEXTS

Edited by

G. A. BIRKETT, M.A.

This series of Russian texts is designed to meet the need for accented readers, equipped with notes and vocabularies. It begins with modern stories, chosen both for their literary qualities and their general interest, and it is proposed to include later some nineteenth-century stories.

These readers are particularly suitable for use as first continuous texts, following a preliminary course on the grammatical basis of the language.

The first titles now available are:

A SIBERIAN FOREST ADVENTURE

By E. BORONINA

The story of a Soviet geologist's journey down a Siberian forest river with samples of gold, and of an attempt on his life by a native guide.

2s. 3d.

KARP

By K. FEDIN

A delightful account of the experiences of two small boys who ran away for a day's fishing. Its author is best known for his novels, which include *Cities and Days* and *The Rape of Europe*.

2s. 3d.

ILYA'S CHILDHOOD and CHILDREN

By MAXIM GORKY

Two stories of the life of children in the underworld which Gorky learned to know so thoroughly in his own childhood.

3s.

METHUEN

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	page
THE DISCUSSION ON THE PERIODI- SATION OF RUSSIAN HISTORY and its Place in the Development of Soviet Historiography - - - - - R. W. Davies	4
NEWS OF SOVIET WRITERS - - - - -	12
1951 DELEGATION REPORTS	
—IN CENTRAL ASIA - - - - - Dr. S. M. Manton, F.R.S.	13
—THE SOVIET HEALTH SERVICES - - - - - Dr. Ian Gilliland	18
A NEW BIOGRAPHY OF PUDOVKIN (Moscow Letter) - - - - - Ralph Parker	23
PUDOVKIN'S FILMS - - - - -	30
SCR FILM SHOWS - - - - -	30
TRADE UNION ACTIVITY IN SOVIET	
Factories - - - - - from <i>V Pomoshch Profsoyuznomu Aktivu</i>	31
BOOK REVIEWS - - - - -	41
(A House of Gentlefolk; 100 Selected Games; British Students in the Soviet Union; Chess from Morphy to Botvinnik; Far from Moscow; Fathers and Children; Guide to the Slavonic Languages; Ilya's Childhood, and Children (Russian Texts); On the Eve; Pioneers of Russian Social Thought; Report on Russia; Russia is for Peace; Russia—the Truth; Smoke; Soviet Documents on Foreign Policy, Vol. I, 1917-1924; Soviet Genetics; The Diplomat; The Genesis of Russophobia in Great Britain; The Lake and the Woods; Virgin Soil; We Have Learned the Truth about the Soviet Union; We Saw Socialism.)	
PUBLICATIONS RECEIVED - - - - -	51
SCR DUPLICATED DOCUMENTS - - - - -	52
SCR NOTES - - - - -	53

ANGLO-SOVIET JOURNAL

Annual subscription 10s. post free (SCR members 8s. 6d.). Single copies 2s. 6d. (post 3d.). Back numbers available.

Editorial Office:

14 Kensington Square, London, W.8

Telephone: WEstern 1571

Readers are invited to submit communications—if possible not more than 2,000 words in length—by the middle of January, April, July and October for the spring, summer, autumn and winter issues respectively.

THE DISCUSSION ON THE PERIODISATION OF RUSSIAN HISTORY AND ITS PLACE IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF SOVIET HISTORIOGRAPHY

By R. W. Davies

THE discussion on the periodisation of Russian history, which took place in the Soviet Union between the end of 1949 and the spring of 1951, cannot be appreciated if considered in isolation. It needs to be examined against the background of the pre- and post-revolutionary development of Russian historical studies, and in the context of the work at present being undertaken by Soviet historians.

CONSIDERABLE advances had already been made in the study of the Russian people's past before the 1917 Revolution. In fact the recording of historical events in Russia dates back to the early chronicles of the eleventh century, and by the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries attempts were made to write accounts of Muscovite princely history. But a *scientific* foundation for the writing of history began to be laid only in the early eighteenth century, when Peter the Great's contemporary Tatishchev initiated the collecting of documentary material. The scope of this work steadily extended throughout the century, and it was systematised in the nineteenth century by the Archaeographical Commission and by various learned societies. Moreover, the historian's field was widened by research into the history of the Russian *people* as distinct from its rulers (e.g. Belayev on the peasantry, 1870); and by the use of archaeology to illuminate the history of production methods, and hence of social structure.

A great increase in the "raw material" at the historian's disposal was accompanied, by and large, by an increasingly realistic approach; but here the blinkers which society fits on its scholars often held up progress.¹ The eighteenth-century historians, culminating in Karamzin, did not advance beyond the view that dynastic struggle and the role of the autocrat were prime factors.

But the clarifying breeze of the French Revolution penetrated Russian scholarship, and the first half of the nineteenth century was a time of groping for a new approach to Russian history consistent with the outlook of the new middle class, which was beginning to make its influence felt in serf Russia. The new synthesis was finally accomplished by Soloviev, who reached a unified and organic view of Russian development. He put the Russian autocracy and state at the centre of his scheme, as having played an essential unifying role in the struggle of the settled "forest" people against the nomadic "steppe" peoples. The Russian princes and state had first unified the tribes and then ward off the attacks of Asiatic invaders and Cossack outcasts.

One-sided as his analysis seems now, it was a turning point in Russian historiography, for it focused attention on the *internal* problems of Russian

¹ In his first broadcast talk on "the New Society", E. H. Carr made some stimulating comments on the relativity of historical knowledge (*Listener*, May 10, 1951). His assumption of the relativity of all historical methodology hardly seems justified, however. See also V. Gordon Childe: *History*, London, 1947.

development and treated them in a dynamic way, bringing together the threads of this approach in the work of his predecessors. When fresh knowledge proved his interpretation inadequate, the historians of tsarist Russia could find no new synthesis to replace it. Kluchevsky turned attention to economic factors, but he did not go beyond fitting economic categories to the old Soloviov framework, resulting in an eclectic confusion. The later historians, with some exceptions, attempted no general synthesis: they specialised in legal history, the history of technique, or in some special period; in some cases they confined themselves to mere factual compilation. Finally, the history of the non-Russian subjects of tsardom lay largely outside their ken.²

The October Revolution might have been expected to bring automatically a new Marxist integration of historical knowledge, a sudden clarity to unsolved problems. To many the work of Pokrovsky, the dominating figure in the Soviet historiography of the 1920s, seemed at first to have done this. He himself proclaimed that "in the realm of historical conceptions there is nothing for us to borrow from our predecessors".³ But in fact, like Marr in linguistics, he was using a Marxist jargon to cover up his own deficiencies. He was inconsistent, admitting that he "more than once had to correct his whole outline": in his early period he followed the concepts of Soloviov and Kluchevsky; later he switched to a "new" consideration of economic factors, but exaggerated them into the sole determining ones. Thus he saw Russia's Balkan policy simply as a drive for new markets; and cast a fog of misconceptions round Russian development from Ivan IV (the "Terrible", 1547-84) onwards, by describing the economy as "commercial capitalist", when commerce was barely emerging in the pores of a serf economy which lasted till 1861.⁴

Pokrovsky's dogmatic self-confidence in his mission made his errors the more difficult to detect. In spite of progress in empirical knowledge (especially of economic development, of mass political movements, and of international relations) no new integration was forthcoming under his leadership. That his influence was a brake on historical studies became finally clear during the discussions of fundamental historical problems in the early 1930s, in which the younger Marxist-trained scholars came to the fore, and which finally culminated in the intervention of Stalin, Kirov and Zhdanov in a letter on historical textbooks in 1934, and in a resolution of the Central Committee of the Soviet Communist Party in 1936. General agreement was reached that a fresh start in analysis must be made, accounting for all the complex development of Russia, and replacing hasty generalisations by systematic investigation.

Historical science in the USSR, having cleared away Pokrovsky's oversimplifications, has a considerable body of achievement to its credit in the past sixteen years. In the first place, a large amount of material has been collected and published. The work of archaeologists includes for example Yefimenko's on the palaeolithic period, Rybakov's immense study of Russian handicrafts,⁵ and Tolstov's of Ancient Khorezm.⁶ Many collections of documents have been published, among which the Academy of Sciences' two-volume edition of the *Russkaya Pravda*, the early medieval law codes, is an outstanding example.

² This outline of pre-revolutionary historiography contains only that information essential to understand what follows. A detailed account (in Russian) is given in N. Rubinstein: *Russkaya Istorografiya*, 1940, which has, however, been severely criticised in the Soviet Union (see Cherepnin in *Voprosy Istorii*, No. 6, 1949).

³ This and the following quotation are from M. N. Pokrovsky: *History of Russia* (pub. Martin Lawrence), pp. xii, xiii.

⁴ On "commercial" or "merchant" capitalism, see Maurice Dobb, *Studies in the Development of Capitalism*, 1946, Ch. I, esp. p. 17.

⁵ On this and other work on the early medieval period see *Anglo-Soviet Journal*, Vol. XI, No. 4, pp. 60-61—Winter 1950-51.

⁶ See *Anglo-Soviet Journal*, Vol. XII, No. 2, pp. 4-13—Summer 1951.

Recent numbers of *Voprosy Istorii*⁷ give an indication of the extent of work on local archives.

But the most important achievement of the immediate pre-war years was the new and fruitful solution of major problems of Russian historical development. The basic social formations in Russia have been more or less precisely dated. It has been shown that the predominant form of production relationship throughout the whole period from the eleventh century to 1861 was what is described as a "feudal" one, i.e. one in which the primary producer, while owning at least part of the tools of production himself, is dependent on a military chief, the church, the prince, or a landlord, and compelled to surrender to him part of his own production, a "rent" in labour, in products, or in money.⁸

This realisation that the same basic production relationships predominated during most of Russian history has cleared the way for a study of more detailed problems. The special forms taken by Russian feudalism (using the term in the sense defined above) can be understood only by seeing Russian development in its international context, and not by seeing the economic factor as the *only* one. In the early thirteenth century, Russia stood economically and politically on a level with most of Europe, but during the rest of its history until very recent times it undoubtedly lagged behind. Why was this? Some earlier historians had suggested, and Rybakov and others have confirmed by detailed investigation, that the mid-thirteenth-century Tatar invasion of Russia destroyed much of her economy, and put her at least two centuries behind the rest of Europe. The story of the growth of tsardom, as seen by Soviet historians, is one of a unified state being formed in the struggle against the Tatars and others, and of an autocracy which at times (as with Ivan IV and Peter the Great) strives to overcome the consequences of this retardation, and at others lapses into backwardness.

This analysis has been deepened by the attention given to the role of the mass movements among the primary producers (particularly in compelling Alexander II to introduce the 1861 Serf Reform), and to the part played by non-Russian minorities in the growth of the Russian Empire.⁹

These achievements were summed up notably in the two-volume University *History of the USSR* which, in the words of *Voprosy Istorii* (No. 11, 1949), has "played a big role in educating Soviet youth and forming their world outlook".

But although many major problems have been solved, disagreements among Soviet historians still cover a wide field. In post-war discussions, views have been exchanged on many important questions—the date of transition from pre-feudal to feudal society in Russia, the stages by which feudalism emerged from tribalism (it has been generally agreed that, unlike much of the West, Russia had no distinctive stage of slavery between tribalism and feudalism), the rise of Muscovy from the ruins of the Tatar invasion in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, and the stages of the emergence of capitalist economic relations within serf society in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. But on all these subjects no generally agreed conclusions were reached.

The failure to solve such problems as these seems to be due mainly to two factors. On the one hand, insufficient material has been collected and collated to reduce speculation to a minimum. On the other hand, while Soviet historians agree on the main stages of Russian development, the detailed periodisation within feudalism and capitalism has not been thought out sufficiently, except

⁷ "Questions of History", the monthly journal of the Institute of History of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR.

⁸ On the whole question of the term "feudalism" see Dobb, *op. cit.*, pp. 33-37.

⁹ See some notes on problems of Central Asian history in *Modern Quarterly*, Vol. 6, No. 4, p. 379—Autumn 1951.

for the period since the 1890s, and no adequate criteria for periodisation have been established.

This is not merely a formal problem. Most difficulty is found in delimiting those periods about which disagreement on major questions is most intense. Moreover, the problem is of practical significance in the teaching of history. How shall the teacher divide up his material? It is generally agreed that the periodisation of existing school and university text-books, while a considerable advance on Pokrovsky's, is inadequate, tending to take state structure and legislation as the main criterion, and relegating the life of the people to second place.¹⁰ There are even survivals of the earlier arbitrary periodisation by tsars or by centuries, particularly in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.

Moreover, the plans of current work of the Academy of Sciences included a twelve-volume *History of the USSR*, and many-volumed histories of agriculture, Rusan culture, and Moscow, as well as a university text-book on historiography to replace Rubinstein's [see Note 2]. Clearly, generalising work of so detailed a kind could not be successful in the absence of criteria for periodisation.¹¹

The discussion opened in the columns of *Voprosy Istorii* in November 1949 was thus a timely one. It met with a wide response: the editors received thirty articles from ten universities, twenty-one of which they published during the next fifteen months; the Academy of Social Sciences of the Central Committee of the Soviet Communist Party held an open session, to which historians from Moscow University and the Academy of Sciences were invited; Czech, Bulgarian, and Polish historians contributed.

The contributions dealt with two main themes, somewhat overlapping: the stages of feudal development (i.e. to the abolition of serfdom in 1861) and the stages of capitalist development (including the stages *within* serf society, from the eighteenth century onwards).

The late K. Bazilevich, one of the principal authors of the universities' text-book, opened the discussion on feudal periodisation (*Voprosy Istorii*, 11, 1949) with an analysis primarily in terms of changes in productive forces and relations. He argued that the most important distinguishing feature of feudalism is the type of rent paid by the primary producer to the feudal lord, and used Marx's categories of rent to divide Russian feudalism into two main phases:

- (1) The period of self-sufficient small-scale economies, when labour-rent or product-rent predominate, from the formation of Kievan Russia in the ninth century to the consolidation of Muscovy under Ivan III in the 1480s;

- (2) The period of the growth and strengthening of market relations, of the sale of the peasants' produce on the market in order to pay rent *in money* to the landowner. This lasts from the end of the fifteenth century to the mid-eighteenth century.

Within these major periods Bazilevich made a number of subdivisions on the basis of changes in political structure. The first period he divided into (a)

¹⁰ The Soviet secondary school text-book, *A History of the USSR*, ed. A. M. Pankratova, is available in English (three vols., Moscow, 1947-8).

¹¹ A meeting of the Presidium of the Academy of Sciences noted that of the six volumes of the *History of the USSR* planned for 1946-50, none had been sent to the press, and that no volumes of the *History of Moscow* had been published. It was decided that of the sixteen volumes of the USSR history, ten should be published in 1951/5 (two in 1951) and that two volumes of the *History of Moscow* should be published in 1951. The seven-volume history of culture was replaced by a single volume. Similar holdups had occurred with the thirty-volume World History. (*Vestnik Akad. Nauk* 12, 1950.) In his report to the annual meeting of the Academy on February 2, 1951, Topchiev reported an improvement in work in the historical field. (*Vestnik Akad. Nauk*, 3, 1951, p. 53).

the growth of feudal relations, to the mid-eleventh century; and (b) *feudal dismemberment*, from then to the 1480s, when the Kiev state was broken up into a number of semi-independent principalities. The second period was subdivided at the end of the seventeenth century, its first half being named *the formation and development of the Russian centralised multi-national state* (1480s—1676), and the second half *the formation of the absolutist state* (1689—mid-eighteenth century).

In subsequent issues of *Voprosy Istorii*, Bazilevich was subjected to strong criticism. He had failed to apply his own main criterion of feudal rent accurately. To describe the whole period from the end of the fifteenth century as one of money rent is certainly wrong. As A. Zimin pointed out (*Voprosy Istorii*, 3, 1950), even in the mid-sixteenth century rent in kind overwhelmingly predominated, and in fact the most important characteristic of peasant economy during the sixteenth century was the resurgence of *labour rent*, as a result mainly of the attempts of Ivan IV to strengthen the Russian state by settling small serving-men [*dvoryane*], mainly exacting labour services from their peasants, on the former big estates.¹² All this was ignored by Bazilevich, whose division was entirely artificial: there seems little doubt that self-sufficient estates and hence rent in labour or in kind were the typical feature of the Russian countryside at least till the mid-eighteenth century (see Pyankov, *Voprosy Istorii*, 5, 1950).

Further criticisms were made of his subdivisions. S. Yushkov (*Voprosy Istorii*, 1, 1950) claimed that, as in previous discussions (1940, 1946), Bazilevich was merely defending the usual periodisation of the text-books. Yushkov agreed with Bazilevich's main criterion, but put forward his own subdivisions on the basis of state structure. P. Miroshnichenko (*Voprosy Istorii*, 2, 1950) pointed to a number of anomalies in Bazilevich's suggestions (e.g. 1676-89 is omitted from the periodisation, and no explanation of the 1725-1760s subdivision is given).

Meanwhile, the discussion on the periodisation of the capitalist period taking place simultaneously made it clear (as had some of the contributions already mentioned) that many historians did not accept Bazilevich's criterion for periodisation as the main one. N. Druzhinin, in his opening contribution, argued that not productive relations, but *the development of the class struggle*, should be taken as the main factor, as "the motive force of the historical process within the bounds of every class society". However, in his actual analysis, he did not apply this criterion consistently. Instead he used the somewhat arbitrary concept (first put forward in 1948 by Yatsunsky) of a division into

(1) *Elements* of capitalism within feudalism, up to the 1760s, before any distinctive capitalist structure had formed;

(2) Capitalist *structure* [*uklad*] within feudalism, 1760-1861, when the all-Russian market had formed, and all sections of the economy were turning towards commodity production;

(3) Capitalism as predominant, 1861-1917.

Like Bazilevich, he made subdivisions within the main periods, so that the period of capitalism, for example, was split into (a) 1861-82, the first stage after the serf reform, culminating in the revolutionary situation of 1879-81; (b) 1883-1900, mature pre-monopoly capitalism, when the working class was beginning to take a leading role; (c) 1901-17, imperialism (in Lenin's sense), the preparation for the proletarian revolution.

Druzhinin put these subdivisions forward with some caution, remarking that "the living historical process is an uninterrupted one, and its events and relationships are uninterruptedly linked, so that in indicating a certain date

¹² See Grékov: *Krestyane na Rusi*, 1946, Part 4; P. A. Sadikov: *Ocherki po istorii oprichniny*, 1950.

we are by no means intending to dissect the living body of history into dead disconnected lumps", and that "while these periods help us to comprehend the law-governed course of historical events, and the successive changes of social relations, they cannot pretend to a fully adequate correspondence with reality as we know it".¹³

And in fact later contributors were able to show the inadequacy of many of his boundaries: M. Gudoshnikov, for example (*Voprosy Istorii*, 1, 1950), considered that the arguments used by Druzhinin for taking the 1760s as a boundary for his capitalist "structure" applied equally well to the mid-seventeenth century, the eighteenth century, and the early nineteenth century.

At the beginning of 1951, attempts were made to summarise the results of each of the parallel discussions. Druzhinin wrote a reply to the discussion on capitalism (*Voprosy Istorii*, 1, 1951) in which he clarified a number of his original points, but, as the Editors of the journal pointed out (3, 1951), he "fails to present the general viewpoint of Soviet historians on the basic stages of the historical process on the territory of the USSR in the period of capitalism".

In view of Bazilevich's untimely death,¹⁴ Pashuto and Cherepnin prepared a report on the discussion of feudalism, which was published in a reworked form (*Voprosy Istorii*, 2, 1951) after a discussion in the Institute of History (21-25 December, 1950). This report was an unsatisfactory one. In addition to numerous errors of detail, many of its proposals for periodisation were arbitrary. For example, for the 1600-1800 period it suggested that the internal subdivisions should be "the class struggle of the mid-seventeenth century [the town uprisings], the Razin and Pugachov movements [peasant revolts]". This would give the following subdivisions: (a) c. 1600-1648/50; (b) 1651-1670/1; (c) 1672-1773/5; (d) 1776—c. 1800. This gives a completely unbalanced picture, and no special role at all to Peter the Great and his activities in bringing forward Russia from backwardness.

In fact, it was becoming clear by the end of 1950 that there were considerable weaknesses in the discussion. Contributors were getting more and more tied up in metaphysical arguments on the relative merits of this, that or the other factor, and bringing very little factual material to bear on the controversial problems. This was particularly evident in a contribution from I. Smirnov. He attempted to take state formation as the main criterion, basing his arguments almost entirely on quotations from Lenin and Stalin, and even saying that the problem lay

"not in establishing some new periodisation of the USSR, but in working-up and concretising the fundamentals for Marxist-Leninist periodisation of the history of the USSR, contained in the Marxist classics, and the writings of Lenin and Stalin". (*Voprosy Istorii*, 12, 1950, p. 83.)

His article was discussed by the Leningrad Department of the Institute of History, and strong disagreement with it was expressed. A hard-hitting reply by A. Predtechensky pointed out that Lenin in the quotations cited had been dealing particularly with problems of state development, and that "the mistake of participants in the discussion was that they took separate statements and works of the Marxist classics on separate problems of history as generalisations", instead of basing themselves on "the general direction of Leninist thought in all its tremendous variety and richness". Druzhinin, Smirnov, and Bazilevich had all quoted bits from Lenin and Stalin to justify their widely differing views. This was quite the wrong approach.

¹³ The inherent difficulties involved in periodising a complex historical development cannot but lead to simplification, as with other classificatory systems. This aspect of the problem did not receive much attention in the discussion.

¹⁴ The death of both Bazilevich and his close co-worker Bakhrushin in the early months of 1950 was a serious blow to Soviet medieval studies. Their obituaries appear in *Voprosy Istorii*, No. 3, 1950, and bibliographies of their works in Nos. 6 and 7, 1950.

In the third number of the journal for 1951, the Editors, in drawing general conclusions from the discussion, support these strictures of Predtechensky's, adding: "Stalin severely condemned such practices, pointing out that citing separate conclusions and formulæ of Marxism up-hill and down-dale has nothing in common with science or with real Marxism".

They also point out that the discussion was weak in dealing with the periodisation of the *Russian* people alone; while this was inevitable ten or fifteen years ago, they say, new text-books have now been published on the history of many non-Russian nationalities, and "a very important and indispensable task of historians of the USSR now is to write works on the history of our country in which the history of all our peoples is given in all the complexity of their mutual relations". A prerequisite of this, in the view of the Editors, is the clarification of a number of questions on the history of these peoples, especially of their unification with Russia.¹⁵

Finally they state that "a big fault in the discussion was that questions of periodisation . . . were looked at *separately from the periods and events of world history* . . . leading to the underestimation of the role and significance of the peoples of our country in the world historical process".

It needs to be added that the blame for these weaknesses lay partly with the Editors themselves. The objects of the discussion were not made very clear at first; the initial contributions were not, in my view, sufficiently well thought out to begin such an important discussion; the Editors did not step in early enough when it was clear that the contributions were becoming too abstract, and, as Predtechensky pointed out, they made the mistake of publishing material on irrelevant side issues, leading to confusion.

This does not mean that the discussion was fruitless. In the first place, it brought clarity to the problem of the criteria for periodisation within feudalism and capitalism, the importance of which is indicated above.

Bazilevich's division of feudalism by changes in rent was generally rejected as incorrect in principle. Relying on changes in methods of production and production relations for periodisation is insufficient; as the Editors of *Voprosy Istorii* pointed out, such a subdivision "is far from reflecting all the complexity and multiplicity of the historical process". One example will illustrate this: the negative significance of the Tatar invasion, an *external* factor, to the whole development of Russia, including the development of its production, is indicated above; but in Bazilevich's scheme it is relegated to a completely secondary place.

Smirnov's use of the changes in state structure as the decisive criterion is also unacceptable, for it ignores the way in which the state structure often lags behind the economic relations and forces (as for example in the period before 1861, when a top-heavy autocracy was holding back the development of the production forces).

Most contributors agreed that the importance of the class struggle, especially the peasant revolts of the seventeenth, eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, had been underestimated in the previous periodisations, and that it was in fact the main factor. But it was also generally agreed (tacitly even by Druzhinin himself, when he did the actual work of periodisation) that it was not the only or the universal element. In their article, the Editors of *Voprosy Istorii* point out that foreign events, such as the Tatar or Napoleonic invasions, are sometimes decisive; and in any case the actual outbreaks of class struggle are often

¹⁵ A start was made on this by two articles in *Voprosy Istorii*, No. 4, 1951: Nechkina on the formula of the "lesser evil", and Yakunin on the national movement in Kazakhstan in the 1830 and 1840s.

expressed in laws, institutions, and in people's consciousness. All these factors combined reflect the development of the mode of production.¹⁶

This exchange of views on criteria, while not providing a new periodisation in detail, did supply valuable material for history teachers and for the compilers of text-books.

The discussion was also helpful because it made clear where there was agreement, where disagreement, and where further research was necessary. Thus it gave Soviet historians a bird's-eye view of the present state of historical science as concerns Russian history. A useful chronological summary in this respect was given in the Editor's concluding article.

On the pre-feudal period, it was generally agreed that class society came into being among the Eastern Slavs as early as the seventh and possibly the sixth century AD, that the Kiev state was not the first Slav state, and that the ninth—tenth centuries are a period of the *completion* of the pre-feudal stage. However, data for these centuries are still scanty, and there certainly does not seem enough evidence for the view (expressed by Dovzhenko and Braichevsky) that the unified Kiev state was a *feudal* state (this problem is discussed ambiguously by the Editors).

While the outstanding significance of the Tatar invasion for the period of feudal dismemberment was of course agreed, there was considerable unclarity on the succeeding rise of Muscovy (fourteenth and fifteenth centuries). Some historians, in emphasising the undoubted *acceleration* of the formation of Muscovy owing to the threat of foreign invasion, completely ignored the *sine qua non* of the Muscovite state, the economic revival of the second half of the fourteenth century. There was also some discussion about the usual division of the rise of Muscovy into two stages—the growth of (a) the *Russian* state, and (b) the *multinational* state arising from this. It was agreed that this was unreal, for as soon as it began to form, Muscovite Russia included non-Russian peoples (Mordvinians, Udmurty, Komi). But no satisfactory analysis has been made of the emergence of the separate Great-Russian, Ukrainian, and White-Russian nationalities. Detailed research into all these problems is the condition for their satisfactory resolution.

For the later centuries, the main interest centred on the emergence and growth of capitalist relations.

When did an all-Russian market form, as the preliminary to the growth of capitalism? There was general agreement that the level of economic development in the Muscovite period had been somewhat underestimated, and that under Ivan IV and Boris Godunov (at the end of the sixteenth century) the country-wide market was forming, only to be held up by Polish and Swedish invasions in the early seventeenth century (the "Time of Troubles"), in resisting which some of the merchants took an active part. But the term "all-Russian market" was inadequately defined, and further research is needed here also.

Little clarity was brought to the analysis of the emergence of specifically capitalist relationships *within* serf society. What the terms "capitalist elements" and "capitalist structure" used by Druzhinin meant remained unclear, and they distracted attention from the demarcation between the pre-manufacturing stage and that of manufacturing (in the sense of *hand-facture* for a market). All agreed on the importance of the Pugachov revolt, and that the arbitrary division of Russian history into periods "up to the nineteenth century" and "from the nineteenth century onwards" has no basis in historical fact.

The Editors point out that the ventilation of disagreements on the rise of

¹⁶ The effects of too crude an application of the "class struggle" theorem were seen in a series of articles by Porshnev on feudalism, published in the *Izvestia Akad. Nauk*, History and Philosophy Section, Vol. V, No. 6, Vol. VI, No. 6, Vol. VII, No. 3, Vol. VII, No. 5, 1948-50. A reply to them by Kosminsky, the well-known medievalist, is published in Vol. VIII, No. 3, 1951.

capitalism began in 1946/7 (a discussion took place at this time in *Voprosy Istorii*) and that "it became clear then that the discussion of these problems could not have positive results without thorough research into the economic life and social struggle of the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. Now, as a result of the new discussion, we reach the same conclusion: there has still not been enough research on the question, though several major works have recently been published".

They add that research is particularly needed into the social and economic nature of the "manufactories" of the eighteenth century, including those of Peter, and into the industrial revolution in Russia.

Finally, on capitalism itself (1861-1917) the majority agreed with Druzhinin's division into three periods outlined above.

The issues of *Voprosy Istorii* since the discussion have shown that its lessons have been taken into account by Soviet historians. Some valuable articles on general problems have been published [I. Kon on *The Specific Nature and Tasks of Historical Science*, No. 6, 1951; V. Yatsunsky on *The Structure of University History Text-books*, No. 4, 1951 (a particularly stimulating contribution)], and there has been some discussion on the periodisation of history in the Soviet period (Nos. 6 and 7, 1951). A number of useful communications have been published [M. Rabinovich on *Archaeological Research in a Moscow Suburb* [twelfth—eighteenth centuries], No. 5, 1951; P. Karyshkovsky on *Russo-Bulgar Relations at the time of Svyatoslav's Balkan Wars* [964-972], No. 8, 1951]; considerable attention has been given to the history of the non-Russian peoples of the USSR, and reviews have tended to be of a higher standard.

While there has been little new material as yet on the unsolved and disputed problems that have been outlined, it seems safe to say that a fruitful period for Russian historical studies has been initiated by the discussion on periodisation.

—October 1951

NEWS OF SOVIET WRITERS

FADEYEV, Alexander. Author of *The Young Guard*. Has just obtained a year's leave of absence from his administrative duties and has gone to gather material for a new novel about the construction schemes.

KATAYEV, Valentin. Author of *Lone White Sail* and other well-known novels, severely criticised for his novel *For Soviet Power* (see ASI, Vol. XI, No. 2, 1950, for critical article by M. Bubennov). This novel has been almost completely rewritten and will go to the printers next spring.

SHOLOKHOV, Mikhail. World-famous author of *Quiet Flows the Don* and *Virgin Soil Upturned*. Has been working for eight years in his home village on the Upper Don on a full-length novel *They Fought for their Homeland*. A painstaking and exacting writer, Sholokhov is now completing the correction of the galley-proofs of a third version of this novel, which he called back three times from the printers and further rewrote. It is hoped that the demands of his large reading public will persuade him to let this third version reach final publication early in 1952.

ZOSHCHENKO, Mikhail. Severely criticised during the 1946 discussions on literature in the USSR; is living in the writers' colony just outside Leningrad and engaged on a novel which he hopes to send to the printer in the late spring of 1952.

BABAYEVSKY, Semyon. Author of *Cavalier of the Gold Star* and *Light over the Earth*. Working on new novel *Banner of Life*.

BUBENNOV, Mikhail. Author of *The White Birch*. Working on Part 2.

KOPTYAYEVA, Anna. Author of *Ivan Ivanovich* (English translation Dr. Arzhanov). Working on new novel *Friendship*.

SEMUSHKIN, Tikhon. Author of *Alitet Goes to the Hills*. Working on new novel *Great Path*.

1951
S.C.R. DELEGATION
REPORTS

IN CENTRAL ASIA

By Dr. S. M. Manton, F.R.S.



ONE summer morning came a letter inviting me to go to the Soviet Union for the purpose of meeting scientific colleagues. A more unexpected suggestion could hardly have been proposed to me. I have worked in many parts of the world, and the more one travels the farther afield does one wish to explore.

"Where do you wish to go? What do you want to do?" they asked me in Moscow, and (among other things) "To Central Asia" was my request, Central Asia, where no British delegation had been since the war.



BETWEEN the Volga and the Tien Shan mountains of China, and flanked to the south by Afghanistan, lie the deserts of Central Asia, in summer as hot as the hotter areas of India and China, snow-covered at times in winter. Many scanty streams disappear into the sand, but two mighty rivers carry fast-flowing water from the Tien Shan and Pamir ranges and, flowing to the north-west, empty into the Aral Sea. The Kara Kum desert extends westward to the Caspian Sea, but in the third/fourth millennium BC a branch of the Amu Darya separated off near its delta into the Aral Sea and traversed this plain to another delta on the Caspian. Ruins of ancient cities and of old irrigation works lie in the desert and in the Kysyl Kum between the Amu and Syr Darya rivers, indicating a bygone splendour which vanished with the water.

The people are now of several races, Uzbeks, Tadjiks, Tatars, and so on, and they constituted formerly a colony of Tsarist Russia. They live in desert oases and in the watered valleys near the hills. In 1918 only 1.6% of the population was literate, and there was no proper education at all. Arabic was taught for the reading of the Koran, but to the people this was a foreign language. One hundred and fifty schools prepared the future officials and interpreters, catering for 17,200 children in all. There was no technical or higher education of any sort, and no pre-school education. The women were veiled and lacked social rights, education, and medical aid.

Today, in Uzbekistan, one of the five Asian republics, there are 5,000 schools teaching 1,300,000 children, both boys and girls. Obligatory ten-year schools operate in the larger centres, and in the outlying areas (as a temporary measure) seven-year schools. In 70% of the schools, and in the two universities of Tashkent and Samarkand, the Uzbek language is spoken, Russian being a compulsory second language; in the remaining schools the teaching is in Russian. Illiteracy has almost disappeared, and all persons now grow up at least bi-lingual. In 1930 the transliteration of the Uzbek language into an alphabet based on the Russian was effected, so that now one alphabet of an easier type serves both languages.

The two universities have played a great part in the development of the republic, and have been concerned with the establishment of the thirty-six other institutes of higher education. Seventeen teachers' training establishments, with

polytechnics, Institutes of Medicine, of Agriculture, of Law, of Economics and of Fine Art, and the Academy of Sciences, with its affiliated research institutions, is no mean achievement in so short a time. The industrial output of Uzbekistan in 1913 was estimated at 269 million roubles; in 1937 it had risen to 1,668 million, and by 1950 to 2,800 million.

Women enjoy equal rights with men, as in other parts of the Soviet Union; I saw only three veiled women in Tashkent. The available labour power has been enormously increased by the emancipation of the women. But, as in Russia, a woman's first duty is considered to be that of the home and the rearing of children; in this she is given every assistance. Crèches and kindergartens, as well as polyclinics and feeding facilities, form part of the usual services provided by factory and farm. A thousand kindergartens have already been established, besides those situated on collective farms.

It was against this background of prodigious advance from a state of illiteracy and oppression that we saw all we could of Uzbek industry, agriculture, scientific research, plans for the future and, what is perhaps most important, the personality of the citizens growing up under this new order of freedom and opportunity.



INSTEAD of the six-day rail journey from Moscow to Tashkent, the capital of Uzbekistan, we went by plane. We were called at 1.45 a.m. in Moscow, and broke our flight once at Aktyubinsk, south of the Ural mountains. Beyond the Volga, the steppe becomes transformed into semi-desert, and for five hours after leaving Aktyubinsk (at a speed of about 200 m.p.h.) no living thing was seen, no sign, beyond the railway, of man's activities. Only the salt patches left by drying ponds after rain, and a few dry watercourses, broke the monotony; near the railway flowed the Syr Darya between its arid banks.

Suddenly the sparkling irrigation channels and the green crops and trees of the Tashkent oasis were below us. Such luxuriance and colour had not been seen for a thousand miles. The silver streaks of glittering water in the ploughed furrows between rows of cotton plants converted the barren desert into a scene of joyous and inviting prosperity. Trees and waterways lay everywhere, shading the footpaths.

The centre of the town passes insensibly into the suburbs and then into the farmland, and beyond the last irrigation channel lies the inhospitable desert. A large hygienic city for 1,300,000 persons is replacing the mud-brick dwellings with their characteristic thatched walls encircling courtyards and fields. Fine wide streets and open squares, imposing administrative buildings, and airy blocks of modern flats in an eastern style, form much of the centre. Several large parks divide the built-up areas, and others will soon be laid out along the banks of the rivers.

The water flowed swiftly: it was the first rapidly moving water we had seen since crossing the Rhine. Electric trams and street lighting, and power to the many factories, are also the result of the small-scale tapping of the potential water power from the Pamirs and associated ranges by the recently built hydro-electric stations. In a few years this power will be more fully exploited to irrigate great areas of desert.

Nowhere did we see squalor, beggars, or disease. We saw no ill-dressed persons; in fact, the women, clad either in European clothes or in native costume of brightly patterned silk trousers and white or gaily coloured tunics, were smarter than in Moscow and quite as smart as in London. Everywhere the people looked happy and healthy.

Our hosts, including the Deputy Prime Minister and the Deputy Chairman of Communications (who were both women) and the Deputy Minister of Education, were anxious that we should waste no moment, and took us to a park

thronged with people, it being Sunday evening. The news of the arrival of the first British delegation since the war to visit Tashkent had preceded us, and girls presented us with flowers. A blaze of lights illuminated trees, flowers, fountains and park buildings, recent in construction. A large lake bore a flotilla of little boats. Kiosks for refreshments and larger restaurants and clubrooms were situated among trees, loudspeakers emitted national songs.

We called at the children's railway. Would the British delegation honour the children by going for a ride? Of course we would; and they got us into stiflingly hot compartments of a full-sized train, with old-fashioned corridor coaches nicely painted up for play, and the children drove us to their next station.

We were attracted by an open-air theatre where perhaps 2,000 people were watching Uzbek dancing and listening to music. We were given a rousing welcome from the audience, and the performance was suspended until our chairman had made a speech in return.

In another park a semi-permanent exhibition of apprentices' work was arranged in a circle where converging paths met. A lathe stood in the open, with tools displayed uncovered on a wooden hoarding. Next to this, a table bore mathematical models and instruments. Books of local and specialist interest were clipped to another hoarding, including an illustrated "Fauna".

Before the Revolution Uzbekistan possessed no theatres, the Islamic religion preventing portrayal of the human form. Now dozens of theatres (and hundreds of cinemas) are in operation and present ballet and opera, translations of the great plays of all nations, and modern products by local writers. As we drove about the town an advertisement for *Othello* caught our eyes. The building of a new opera house was started in 1938, but was interrupted by the war; the Uzbeks did not, however, wait for the end of the war to continue their masterpiece of modern architecture, with its immense areas of hand-carving and eastern designs, and the whole was finished between 1943 and 1946.

We first approached the Opera House by night. It stands apart, shown up by its enchanting external illumination. Both outside and inside, the beauty of this edifice moved me more than that of any building I have ever seen in any country. Besides the stage and auditorium, the Opera House contains eight large public halls and other offices. A performance of *Madam Butterfly* had nothing to learn from anything I had seen in England. A local opera, *Gulsara*, in Uzbek, illustrated the history of the emancipation of women since 1918. At both performances our entry into the Opera House was greeted by a spontaneous roar of applause.

In the Uzbek State Museum, the riot of colour of the local art is striking—the carpets, the pottery, the eighteenth- and nineteenth-century wall ceramics, and the carved plaster panels from decayed historic buildings (such as we had seen repeated in the Opera House). Some galleries are entirely filled with Uzbek paintings and portraits of the last thirty years, during which the Uzbeks have for the first time portrayed the human form. All showed great mastery in execution, colour and design.

Russia depends on Uzbekistan for 70 per cent of her raw cotton; in return, Uzbekistan needs wheat and tractors and machinery of all kinds. The production of cotton takes up 40 per cent of the agricultural effort of Uzbekistan, while fruit-growing also takes a high place.

We visited the *Kyzyl-Uzbekistan* collective farm, started in 1930 by 295 families. The farm now embraces 740 families, cultivates four times the original area of land, and has an increasing amount of agricultural machinery. The income per working day has increased nine times since 1932, and in addition each member receives a large amount of produce to use or to sell as he pleases. Cotton is the main crop, but large yields of melons, hard fruits, grapes and

vegetables are to be seen in the fields. Cattle, horses, sheep, pigs, poultry and bees have greatly increased in numbers.

We were entertained to dinner in the fields, where course after course kept us occupied for two hours at a table piled with flowers, fruit, wine and various dishes. Nothing was too much trouble to our hosts, who took us about the farm and answered our many questions. We also visited the workers' houses and the children's nursery belonging to the farm. A mixture of eastern furnishings with modern bedsteads and electric irons, with large stoves for the winter cold, gave considerable comfort. The standard of the crèches and nurseries in Tashkent was the same as we had seen in Stalingrad and Moscow. Everything was well arranged, and the personality of the women in charge seemed to be of the best.

Until recently, raw cotton was transported to Moscow and other places and returned again as cloth. Now, the modern textile factory (the Stalin Mill) in Tashkent receives the raw cotton from the farms and supplies Middle Asia with high-quality cotton goods in great variety, at an immense saving in transport. The enterprise was started in 1932 and reached full production by 1939.

Besides the output of the modern factory, which has little if anything to learn from either Lancashire or the USA, the workers have the products of their own kitchen gardens and goods from a department store; modern apartment houses solve the housing problem; and their domestic and cultural needs are met by a nursery, a kindergarten, canteens for meals (in which we saw a varied menu of low-priced dishes being served from hatches on to small tables, under conditions of good ventilation and cleanliness), a polyclinic with 250 beds, two cinemas, and a "Palace of Culture" to complete the amenities.

Near the entrance to the factory, large screens bore photographs of the best workers, and their features (as in the ball-bearing factory we visited in Moscow) indicated that several races were working together. All the equipment appeared to be of the most modern design. In one sector every girl was in charge of two spinning-machines, each operating 400 spindles. In another shop, containing approximately 3,500 automatic looms, each girl operated from 24 to 28 looms, the average being 27; and there were many such shops. A dozen or more girls worked in an art studio, painting designs and trying out new patterns.

This textile factory's Palace of Culture resembled those in other parts of the USSR. Its theatre for amateur dramatics had 800 seats, upholstered and comfortable, and the whole was beautifully lit and decorated. Some forty other rooms ministered to cultural needs.



DESERT covers 50 per cent of Uzbekistan and Kazakhstan and 85 per cent of Turkmenia, but it is planned to bring water back to part of this immense area by 1957. This year the building of the main Turkmenian Canal was started. It is to extend for about 746 miles from the Amu Darya river to the Caspian Sea, following in part the course of the dried-up Uzboi river. A railway and a feed-canal have already been built to transport materials and to provide water for the workers, the hydraulic machinery, and local crop-growing. An experimental base for scientific work has been established in the Kara Kalpak. Three hydro-electric stations will be situated along the canal, and work near Takhia Tash is already in progress. Branch canals extending for 746 miles will bring water to an area of 20,500,000 acres.

At present the scientific research work of the Central Asian republics is to a large extent dominated by the needs arising out of the rapid economic developments, the biological problems related to which demand immediate attention. The Tashkent Academy of Sciences, founded in 1943, integrates the activities of twenty-three research institutes. I visited the zoological institute.

an imposing building standing in its own grounds. In Tashkent there work sixty full-time research zoologists, in addition to those partly engaged in teaching. The specialists I met were nearly all of the Uzbek race; they were studying problems of entomology, vertebrate physiology, parasitology, soil protozoology, animal breeding, ecology, and so on. The laboratory facilities are adequate for the work in progress, and no difficulty is experienced in obtaining apparatus. The individual research rooms are well laid out, and within the building there is a biochemical laboratory, a darkroom with photomicrographical apparatus, and so on, for those who need them, and plenty of room for the instalment of specialist requirements.

A great body of scientific work of many kinds, associated with the national construction projects for irrigation and hydro-electric power, has been undertaken, and scientific work is planned on a large scale. Among the most important tasks before the scientists is the determination of existing climatic conditions in the construction areas and the forecasting of the changes likely to result from the irrigation and afforestation work. For this purpose many expeditions have been collecting data, and meteorological stations have been established at many places in the Caspian lowlands, in the Turkmenian desert and elsewhere. Weather experts are trying to assess the potential changes in climate, and there is much discussion as to exactly what will happen as a result of the next few years' construction programme. The problem is a difficult one. In the Caspian lowlands drought and dry winds are the deterrents to agriculture. Investigations are in progress towards discovering the origin of these winds, and this involves a study of all the factors that determine the temperature, the humidity, and the movements of the air near the ground. Detailed study is being made on the gradual heating of the air circulating over the Caspian region and of the increase in its drying properties. A problem of some importance is that of forecasting the reduction in level of the Aral and Caspian Seas that will result from the utilisation of large volumes of water for irrigation. A reduction in level is welcomed up to a point, and the long-term projects concerning the Siberian rivers is to be correlated with the effects of the immediate scheme.*

At the scientific base in the Kara Kalpak this summer, about 300 persons from all parts of the Soviet Union were engaged, and in addition to this numerous scientific expeditions, composed of either zoologists or botanists or of a mixed party of biologists and others, have been at work in the field. There were twenty-two such biological expeditions in the Kara Kalpak this summer. Some Tashkent zoologists had just returned, and others were still working on expeditions. A party of zoologists from the Turkmenian Academy of Sciences has travelled about 2,500 miles in the southern part of the Turkmenian Canal region, in the valleys of the Atrek, Sumbar and Chandir rivers. The biological parties usually number from twelve to twenty persons.

The biological work is mobile, but several semi-permanent desert stations have been set up, besides the small laboratories on the Caspian and Aral Seas; photographs of these were shown to me. The compilation of local faunas and floras is going ahead in Central Asia as well as elsewhere in the Soviet Union. Efforts are made to obtain all varieties of animals and plants from the wild that may be turned to economic use, and a special study is being made of varieties existing naturally under difficult conditions. Seeds of plants wanted for particular purposes are being collected.

Ecological studies are stressed. The conditions under which organisms live is considered in detail, and ecological surveys of oases and areas of special interest are being made. Detailed studies of soils are in progress, not only to

* For more details of these enormous schemes of irrigation, river-diversion, hydro-electric construction, afforestation, and so on, as part of the five great integrated construction projects, see *ANGLO-SOVIET JOURNAL*, Vol. XII, No. 3 (Autumn 1951): **J. D. Bernal on Developments in Science.**

determine their nature but cultivation of their micro-organisms is carried on in laboratories, as I saw in Tashkent. Methods of combating shifting sand are being tackled, both by investigating sand-fixing vegetation and by treating the surface with a by-product from industry which leaves the sand permeable to water and to plant growth but prevents it blowing about. A special laboratory has been built in Turkmenia to study sandstorms.

A very large field is that of ascertaining the natural pests of the trees and shrubs that are about to be planted in large numbers, so that measures may be taken in time to prevent wholesale destruction by pests which may multiply inordinately as a result of the altered balance of nature. Both insects and rodents are being worked on from this aspect. The possible damage to pastures as well as to drier places is being studied. Predators and parasites of domestic or potentially domestic animals are being investigated, and every opportunity is being taken to follow out the complex life-cycles of flatworm and other parasites that utilise two or more hosts. For this, the mollusc fauna becomes of importance, and the determination of species and habits is being accomplished. Then the work associated with insect vectors of diseases of all kinds is as important here as in other warm countries, and employs many persons. Fly problems are numerous; that of the gadfly, they told me, has already been satisfactorily solved.

The results of the scientific work completed both by expeditions and in the laboratories of Uzbekistan are being published in the Uzbek people's own language in scientific journals and monographs. My impression of this work was that its basis was very broad, that the personnel was competent, and that the scale on which it is being carried out will not only give the immediate information needed for the economic development of Central Asia, but will greatly increase biological knowledge in general.

THE SOVIET HEALTH SERVICES

By Ian Gilliland



Two things are necessary to appreciate the health service of any country: how did the service start, and what growth and changes have been brought about? What place do such services occupy in the scale of values of that society? How much of the energies and money of that society is being spent upon the service, and at what speed are they progressing towards the goal they have set themselves?

The development of modern medicine came late to Tsarist Russia. Until 1768 there was no medical school graduating Russian doctors. Such doctors as existed were trained abroad and were found only in the courts and the big cities. The country knew nothing of scientific medicine. Indeed, in large tracts of the country folklore was the only medicine.

Conditions of life in the country in Russia proper were as primitive as in any other European country. Over vast areas of "colonial" land occupied by the subservient races, life was as primitive as anything that could be found in Asia.

Yet, as early as 1864, the State authorised a system of medical services, to be run on a voluntary basis by the gentry-controlled local authorities, the

Zemstvos. It was totally inadequate in numbers and probably of a generally low standard of service. The Russian Year Book for 1913—a publication issued with official backing—wrote (p. 676): “The state of public health in the provinces is due not only to bad sanitation and unhygienic conditions, but also to the absence of medical aid. Even in provinces where *zemstvos* exists, a large number of the population are left without medical aid.”

Nevertheless, it was the first major historical move to provide medicine for a considerable proportion of a country's population as a public service, and much devoted work was done on it. It preceded by very many years the earliest German insurance schemes, and by many more years the “panel” of Lloyd George. It had one very important effect. Russia was very largely an agricultural country. The peasantry formed by far the largest section of the population: and consequently by the turn of the twentieth century medicine was already traditionally regarded as a public service and not as a trade by the majority of Russian citizens. It is also of interest that, in spite of the late start of academic medicine in Russia, there arose some individual schools of great international repute, such as Pavlov's Institute.

However, the 1914-17 war found the Russian medical profession as a whole unable to tackle the problems before it, and the population as a whole so unhealthy as to make two out of every three unfit for service on medical grounds. It is true to say that at the time of the Revolution medical services throughout Russia were wholly unprepared for the demands put on them, or for the demands about to be put upon them by the civil war and the days of famine and epidemic.

The Soviet Government had from the beginning a firm policy for health, in spite of the disorganised state of society and the chaotic state of the medical service. They set themselves the stupendous task of reorganising the health services of the Soviet Union on the primary basis of prevention of ill health and promotion of good health, as well as the more usual provision of hospital and home services.

It is, of course, very easy to be critical today of the far-off early years of Soviet rule. There is no doubt that the doctors of those days were not well trained; but they were needed in great numbers in areas where there were no doctors at all. Besides, even in those days, refresher courses were obligatory every three years, and this meant that the standard of doctoring was always being raised. There were many experimental ventures. They tried training doctors who were doctors in epidemiology only, or who had experience only of the problems of women and children. All these days now seem far away to a visitor in the Soviet Union in 1951.

In the intervening years, particularly since World War II, the growth of medical service in the Soviet Union has been phenomenal. Today they have enough doctors to carry out a public health service which is much more all-embracing than ours. Today not only are they sufficient in numbers, but their course of training is as long as ours and has in addition a part of the sixth year spent in practice in the health centres, which is the equivalent of our general practice. In this respect they are moving in advance of most other countries.

What most strikes the visitor today is the orientation of their health services towards preventive medicine. The USSR is the first country to have tried to establish an integrated health service based on prevention of ill health and promotion of good health.

This obviously entails a vast amount of routine examination. Their object is that everyone shall be examined at least once a year. They told us that this had certainly been difficult at first, but they think that they have now achieved this desirable object. Many people are examined much more frequently, especially workers exposed to danger. Coal miners, for instance, have an exami-

nation which includes an X-ray of their chests once a month. The frequency with which a person is examined depends upon the risks to which he is exposed. The system of routine examination starts with the birth of the child. At first every child is seen at least once a month by doctors who specialise in this particular work, pediatrics being a very highly developed speciality in the USSR.

While this system of routine examination is of itself a very desirable thing, it must, where ill health threatens, be backed up by appropriate measures. There is no doubt that in this field the Soviet Union stands alone. It has a vast network of rest homes, holiday camps, sanatoria and so on, which are designed primarily as part of the health service to back up the routine examination. Part of the doctor's job is to send people to these rest homes, sanatoria or holiday camps when he thinks they are not very well, not to wait until they become ill.

The problem which at first faced the Soviet Government, that of getting the people to accept scientific medicine, let alone to accept this very elaborate scheme of promoting good health, was enormous. They overcame it by education, by getting the people themselves to play their part.

As early as 1928 the Soviet Government set up a Central Research Institute on Health Education. We visited this Institute and had a very interesting day with its enthusiastic staff. Its function is to prepare material on health education which goes to doctors, nurses, schools, clubs and the general public, and also to research into new and better ways of educating the public in health. The Central Institute has daughter institutes in each Republic, and all these institutes have very close ties with the Ministries of Health, with the doctors and nurses, with the Soviet Red Cross and Crescent workers, and, most important of all, with the Ministries of Education; this last enables a great deal of health education to be done in schools. When we asked them for an example of the effectiveness of their work, they told us: "Nowadays everyone comes for the compulsory medical examinations; when we started work only 60% used to come."

We inspected a great deal of their material and watched one or two of their films. They seem to set themselves very high targets. For instance, they are going to "liquidate tuberculosis" and "liquidate venereal disease". They are tackling the problem of cancer enthusiastically and, we thought, very well. We saw pamphlets explaining to schoolchildren what is known about cancer. They teach the whole public the known facts in a very hopeful and optimistic way. The whole stress of their education is that cancer can be dealt with if you come early enough and are regularly examined.

This Central Institute also teaches people about the history of medicine, and we saw special pamphlets devoted to such famous Englishmen as Harvey and Darwin. The greatest importance is attached to the work of this Institute; in fact it is obligatory for all doctors and all qualified nurses to spend at least six hours a month in educating the public, helped by the material produced in this Institute. The many doctors to whom we talked seemed most enthusiastic about this part of their work.

We went to an open-air meeting, advertised through the lay press, where there were on the platform seven doctors (including medical and surgical specialists) to answer any questions the general public wanted to ask them. We listened to this for about an hour and a half, and were particularly struck by the enthusiasm and energy of the doctors and by the interest of the general public present.

There is no doubt that the Soviet Union has accumulated a vast wealth of experience in health education, from which we could very usefully benefit. A service designed to prevent ill health must necessarily develop an all-embracing means of educating the public.

Visitors to the Soviet Union in 1951 are struck by the number of doctors they find wherever they go. About 25,000 graduate every year. Six new medical schools have been opened since the war, and the old ones enlarged. We did not get exact figures of the total number of doctors: but our calculations, based on the services we saw, give them about 40% more doctors per 100,000 population than we have. At any rate they now appear to have enough doctors to man their very extensive services on a six-hour day basis. We did not think the newly qualified doctor well paid: but on the other hand, as one of them put it to us, with only six hours a day working time, there is ample time to study, and the possession of higher qualifications immediately raises the income to a good level. In the case of research or teaching, the income is raised to a very good level. In addition to this, with every five years of service the income rises, and also doctors in the country get up to 20% more than doctors practising in towns.

The adequacy of doctors is reflected also in the adequacy of equipment. Health centres are now quite universal, and are organised not only on a regional basis but also on a basis of large factory units. We visited a number of these and watched them working, and saw some of the specialities being run by them. They are the point at which the Soviet citizen first encounters the medical service. He goes there whatever his medical need, or he asks them to send out a doctor to see him if he is unable to go there. Health centre practice corresponds to general practice in this country, but there are quite large differences. For example, doctors work together as a team, and have regular meetings to discuss their problems. Special interests are encouraged; indeed, there is much more emphasis on specialisation. For instance, there is always a special section for children, and in large towns special health centres for children. The hospital specialists attend the health centre, and the health centre doctors follow their patients into hospital. This complete interchange has only existed since 1948, but they claim it has already raised the level of service of doctors practising in centres. They say that before this regulation was introduced, the differences between diagnoses made at the health centre and those made ultimately at the hospital was 25%; this difference has now been brought down to 10%. Just as at the health centres doctors work as a team, so the health centre doctors and the hospital doctors are learning to work together.

Visitors to the Soviet Union in 1951 find more that is familiar in the hospital service. We visited hospitals in Moscow, in Stalingrad, and in Tashkent in Central Asia. The standard seemed to us to be very similar. We did rounds with the doctors, and discussed clinical problems with them as well as administrative ones. Their hospitals have small wards (mostly with eight, six or four beds) and quite a number of single-bedded rooms. It seemed to us, however, that the beds were rather close together even in these small wards.

As regards medical treatment, their methods seemed very similar to ours, and in fact were orthodox by our standards. This is hardly surprising, seeing that British and American journals are freely available to them, and there is a special service which translates articles from all foreign journals for their publications. The only major therapeutic differences are those arising from the intense study of Pavlovian physiology that is being conducted throughout the Union. For instance, some cases of peptic ulceration were being treated with continuous narcosis; at Stalingrad they told us that they had had apparently good results in about 80% of cases.

More striking still, of course, is the general introduction of the method of relaxation in childbirth, which seems rather similar to that advocated in this country by Dr. Grantley Dick Reid. They told us that this was now universal, and in the maternity home we visited in Stalingrad the failure rate was said to be only 3%. There was trilene available in the labour rooms, and the

obstetricians told us that they could pick out most of the potential failures in the initial stages, during the course of six lectures on relaxation which are given individually to the patient; and that most eventual failures were abandoned to the old-fashioned methods of labour at this early stage.

One very striking difference in the hospital service is the profusion of beds available. The Deputy Minister of Health told us that they had fifteen hospital beds per thousand of population, excluding mental defective and psychiatric cases. This figure is, of course, large enough to abolish waiting lists; and wherever we went we asked people in hospitals (especially cases of common operations such as hernia and tonsillectomy) how long they had had to wait before being admitted to hospital. The longest we were able to find was one man who had had to wait three days.

Wherever we went in the Union we were given a most friendly reception by our colleagues. Indeed they seemed to be quite as interested in medicine in Britain as we were in medicine in the Soviet Union. All the doctors we spoke to were aware of the National Health Service: although perhaps not familiar with its every detail, they certainly knew more about it than we did about the services of the Soviet Union. They asked for criticism from our experience, and welcomed it when we gave it. They undoubtedly thought it very well worth while to discuss medicine with us, as we did with them. There is much that we both could learn. They seemed most anxious that this sort of co-operation should be extended in the future, and—as they put it—they were very anxious to co-operate for the peaceful purpose of preserving life.

We finally left, conscious of the fact that when visiting the Soviet Union in 1951 we had studied a service which has changed considerably within recent years and is still developing, and which has only reached its present stage within a relatively few years. The Soviet medical service has grown out of a service which, with brilliant exceptions, was backwards and in parts primitive. It has been brought up to date technically, provided with adequate modern facilities, and is in advance of that in any other country in the appreciation of preventive principles. The speed with which this has been done is characteristic of a society conscious of the importance of health and guided by the principle that: "The health of the people is the concern of the people themselves."

See also *Medical Science in the Soviet Union*, by L. Crome,
ANGLO-SOVIET JOURNAL, Vol. XI, No. 4 (Winter 1950/51).

ASJ MOSCOW LETTER

From Ralph Parker



A NEW BIOGRAPHY OF PUDOVKIN

THE story of Vsevolod Pudovkin's contribution to the art of the cinema is so important a chapter in the history of that art-form that to attempt to tell it is to run the risk of losing sight of the subject in the process. The author of a new Soviet biography* of Pudovkin, A. Mariamov, is to be congratulated on the way he has limited his work to a clear and detailed account of the great Soviet film director's development.

Pudovkin's thirty years' association with the cinema has been a fruitful partnership between a highly gifted, original and, above all, reflective artist and a consciously revolutionary society. That society has been more than a patron, it has been a critic of and a guide to Pudovkin's genius. The story of what Pudovkin has contributed to Soviet cinema cannot be separated from a consideration of what Soviet society has contributed to Pudovkin's own development.



VSEVOLOD ILLARIONOVICH PUDOVKIN was born in Penza in 1893. His father was of peasant origin, and worked as a salesman and later as a commercial traveller. He brought his son to Moscow at the age of four, sent him to a secondary school and then to the university, where he finished a course in natural science in 1914.

Pudovkin had already given evidence of his versatility. As a schoolboy he showed promise both as painter and as musician. As for the cinema of those days, he detested it, sharing with Mayakovsky the opinion that the words "cinematography" and "art" were incompatible.

War broke out before Pudovkin was able to present himself for the state examinations; he went to the front, served in the artillery, and was wounded and taken prisoner. For three years he was held in a prisoner-of-war camp in Pomerania, where he learned English, French and Polish from his fellow prisoners. In November 1918 he was one of a group of Russians who escaped from the camp. A month later he was in Moscow, where he found work as a chemist in the laboratory of the Phosgen No. 1 factory.

It was not until 1920 that Pudovkin, then twenty-seven years old, turned to the cinema. The government had established a school of cinematography in Petrograd: Pudovkin was one of its first pupils.

While it would be true to date the birth of Soviet cinema from the foundation of this school, it should not be overlooked that the cinema as an entertainment industry was already well established in Russia. Cinema-going was part of the routine of Russian town life at the time of the revolution. On the eve of the first world war, about one hundred and fifty films were being distributed annually, most of them home-produced. Both in quantity and in technical quality Russian film production had reached a level at least as high as that of France and Italy. The industry was, however, in capitalist hands,

* *Vsevolod Pudovkin, People's Artist of the USSR*. By A. Mariamov. (Goskinoizdat, Moscow, 1951.)

and was being run on a "quick-profit" basis. The director, script writer, actor and camera man were simply hired men. The film director I. Perestiani, describing those days in his memoirs, writes: "In most cases the film actors did not even read the script, considering that to be the director's affair. I remember how once I asked a very well-known actor who was working under two directors simultaneously what parts he was playing.—The Devil only knows, he replied. A couple of lovers. One with a beard, the other clean-shaven.

In these circumstances it is easy to understand why many progressive and far-sighted men, including, as we have seen, Mayakovsky, dismissed the cinema as a form incompatible with art. At the most they could but share the feelings of Alexander Serafimovich, who dreamed of the day "when men with hearts and consciences would come to cinematography." It is easy to understand, too, why when such men did come to serve the young Soviet art of the cinema they came, not from the existing commercialised industry, but from altogether different directions. As Sergei Eisenstein wrote many years later: "Each one of us found his own way to cinematography. Pudovkin was a chemist, Dovzhenko a teacher; I was an engineer. Kozintsev, Yukiévich and Kuleshov were painters, Alexandrov a film technician, Ermiler a member of the Tcheka, Shengelaya a poet. . . . The mighty hurricane of October tore us away from the most varied activities and professions, carried us along on its great stream and fused together all we brought from various spheres of activity and knowledge, compelling us to work on that great collective creation, our cinematography."

☆ ☆ ☆

THE First State School of cinematography began its work poor in everything but the enthusiasm of its staff and pupils. It possessed no film stock and no cameras or other apparatus. Its first studios were partly ruined. In winter the floors were coated with ice. The pupils themselves, Pudovkin among them, had to get the place into working order.

It was not long, however, before two sharply contrasted styles of film production arose in this first group of Soviet film makers. On the one hand V. P. Gardin favoured a naturalistic approach, on the other L. Kuleshov was working on the theory of montage, demanding of a film that it should reflect not life but the director's skill. Pudovkin worked with both these schools, as actor and as technician. Of his spell of work with Kuleshov, his biographer writes: "This co-operation occurred during Pudovkin's years of study, and there is no doubt that he extracted some very positive experience from his studies under Kuleshov. He learned to understand the special character of the cinema industry . . . he learned to regard the cinema as a form of art with its own laws . . ."

Early in 1925 Pudovkin joined the group of experienced directors, cameramen, artists and actors working in the studios of Mezhrabpom-Rus. With five years' experience behind him—and in those times one lived in a single year of revolutionary life in Soviet Russia what others do not experience in a lifetime—Pudovkin had gained the confidence to express his own theories on cinematography. Though his next film was little more than a brilliant trifle—a 400-metre comedy on the theme of the chess-fever that swept Moscow during the holding of the International Chess Championship in Moscow—it is distinguished by an inner rhythm that his work with Kuleshov had lacked. Moreover, in his theoretical writing of that period he went on record with a definition that foreshadowed much of his later work. "Everything that is clear, simple and natural is photogenic", a formula which drew down on him the fire of the formalists.

Pudovkin then turned his developing talent to a scenario written by a pupil of the great Russian physiologist, Academician I. P. Pavlov. Better equipped than any other film director of that time to embark on a scientific film, he threw himself with enthusiasm into a study of conditioned reflexes. As he

describes it, his attitude was that of one who not only wanted to advance the understanding of science by means of the cinema, but who wanted to enrich the art of cinematography with the help of science.

Throughout his creative career, Pudovkin has been haunted by the idea of filming the birth and development of a scientific idea. He has always been, and remains today, a passionate reader of scientific literature, including many abstruse works on the latest Soviet investigations into the nature of matter. Almost a quarter of a century separates *The Mechanism of the Brain* and *Zhukovsky*, the film in which he successfully showed the conception of an idea that led to the foundation of the science of aerodynamics, but these two pictures both derive from Pudovkin's "secret dream", a dream he is determined to fulfil in further work on this theme.



The Mechanism of the Brain was completed and released in 1926, a year of historic importance in the history of the Soviet Union. 1926 saw the start of socialist industrialisation and, with it, of a self-conscious effort by workers in cinematography, literature and the theatre to assist the Communist Party in its task. The importance of their share in the struggle for socialism made itself felt with increasing persistence as the political and economic problems involved in launching plans for socialisation were solved. By 1927 86 per cent of industry was in the socialist sector; but in the round of daily life, in the street scene, in the shop windows, on bookstalls and billboards the old world of socially irresponsible private enterprise clung pertinaciously to its share of the Soviet citizen's mind. In this atmosphere progress towards a socialist concept of art was slow.

"The bourgeois idealists perorated in innumerable discussions. Moscow had its 'Experimental Theatre' where, on Mondays, plays that had proved failures on the regular stage were put on. The private publishing firms *Leningrad* and *Puchina* poured out translations of the novels of Pierre Benoit, Guido da Verona, and Michael Arlen. In the cinemas Harry Peel leaped from a high bridge on to the roof of an express train, Gloria Swanson and Asta Nilsson minced across the screen. . . ." It was in the atmosphere thus described by Mariamov that the posters announcing the first showings of Eisenstein's *Battle-Cruiser Potemkin* and Pudovkin's *Mother* appeared. The decision to screen Maxim Gorky's novel had been taken in 1925, as part of the celebrating of the twentieth anniversary of the 1905 Revolution; Zheliabuzhsky was first engaged to direct it, but later, on the advice of Lunacharsky, he was replaced by Pudovkin and the preparation of a script was given to N. Zarkhy.

An earlier biographer of Pudovkin, N. Yezuitov, wrote of the *Mother* script: "The script turned out to be extremely simple—a father, a mother and a son, and a drama between them that resulted in great social consequences for the whole family: the father through ignorance joins the ultra-reactionaries, while the mother sees things clearly and comes over to the side of her revolutionary-minded son. Of course, the mother's development is not merely the effect of the influence of personal motives. The value of the script lies in the way that the personal motives in the behaviour of the main characters is linked with the society to which they belong. The heroes never appear to be acting on the author's orders, but move as living people with their own personal desires and class interests."

Perhaps the most important advance in his artistic method that Pudovkin made in his film *Mother* is shown by his choice of actress to play the central character, Nilovna. For this part he turned down a well-known character actress and chose Baranovskaya, a tragic actress from the Moscow Art Theatre company. The fact that he drew from this theatre at all was in itself a sharp break with the practice of the time. "Theatricality" was anathema to the Kuleshov school of film direction. But though he was not seeking "theatricality"

Pudovkin was determined to restore the actor's importance in the cinema. He did not intend his *Mother* to be a documentary description of Russian working-class life on the eve of the 1905 Revolution; he sought a psychological depth in the interpretation of character which would give the experiences of the Vlasov family a validity and a cogent power for a Soviet society advancing towards socialism.

"After *Mother* I learned never to be afraid even of stage actors," Pudovkin has said. His approach to the Moscow Art Theatre company, to the Stanislavsky school of acting, was well rewarded. Baranovskaya's unforgettable acting in such scenes as when she stoops to gather up the pieces of the clock her husband has smashed, when she mourns by his coffin, or when, a woman transformed, she raises the red flag in the demonstration at the end of the film, have exercised a deep influence on subsequent Soviet film acting.

Looking at *Mother* from today's standpoint, Soviet film critics recognise it as the beginning of a development that was to culminate in the Vasiliev brothers' *Chapayev* almost a decade later. They find certain faults in it. Mariamov, for example, considers that a mistake was made in impoverishing the part of Pavel Vlasov by not showing his intellectual formation and the efforts at political self-education that Maxim Gorky so well describes. He finds, too, a certain formalism in the figure of the policeman who appears from time to time in the film. Of these shortcomings Pudovkin has himself written: "I know that all the theoretical foundations of my work were created considerably later than the work itself. I remember my work with the Kuleshov group. When we were filming *The Death Ray* all our group was of a very low cultural level. . . . When I started on *Mother* I had broken right away from Eisenstein and Kuleshov. However, I said to myself: Ah ha, Eisenstein succeeded with a warship. Do you think I'm going to take a picture of a mother? No, I shall concentrate on the policeman!—I first conceived *Mother* as a picture of a downtrodden woman. The culmination of her defeat was to have been a shot showing her under the hooves of a policeman's horse. I had insufficient understanding of the active link between the advance of the working class in 1905 and the October Revolution."

It was, however, more for its progressive qualities than for what are today recognisable as its faults that *Mother* was criticised by many of Pudovkin's colleagues in the Soviet film world when it first appeared. The Kuleshov school accused him of having betrayed its cause, and although *Mother* was well received by the public its director had to endure that absence of encouragement from members of his own profession that so often accompanies the progress of a pioneer and an innovator.

Pudovkin's next film, also made from a script by Zarkhy, was *The End of Saint Petersburg*, a picture that culminates in the capture of the Winter Palace by workers and peasants. It is an optimistic picture which succeeds in casting a bright light forward from 1917 to the time, a decade later, when Soviet people were starting their heroic progress through industrialisation and collectivisation. In its splendid panoramas of revolutionary victory as well as in its penetrating picture of the humiliation of unskilled wage-slaves under capitalism, it played an important educational role in the early years of the first Five-year Plan. Today its faults are seen to lie in Pudovkin's manner of expressing himself in abstractions and symbols rather than by the typical and concrete, as is the method of socialist realism. In some cases this resulted in a misleading concept of history. He typified bourgeois Petersburg by means of architectural shots which, in fact, conveyed the impression of a feudal society whose rulers were in full enjoyment of their power. Shots in which the factory-owner Lebediev appear are juxtaposed with pictures of Peter the Great, superb on his charger. The Russian bourgeoisie of the years before the revolution in fact felt itself far from triumphant.

For his next picture Pudovkin chose a subject designed to show the international character of the 1917 Revolution. 1928 was the year in which in Central China were first united the armed forces of the Chinese Revolution created by Mao Tse-Tung and Chu Teh. The Soviet press was full of telegrams from China, reporting the most dramatic incidents in the Chinese people's struggle for freedom, such as the mass murder of workers in Canton, Nanking and Shanghai, political assassinations and executions in Peking, and the intervention of American gunboats on the Yangtse river. The script for *Storm Over Asia* (*The Heir of Genghis-Khan*) was written by Mayakovsky's close friend Osip Brik on a story by Novokshonov. The fact that he was provided with a well-written script, the work of a writer who knew Mongolia well, was of particular significance at this stage of Pudovkin's work, for he had been playing with an idea, fashionable among his colleagues at that time, of working without a script. With Eisenstein, he advocated full freedom for the director to construct a film from a mass of raw material during the process of montage. Brik's clear short script drew Pudovkin back to an orthodox approach.

In filming *Storm Over Asia* Pudovkin broke new ground by the "documentary" style he adopted. For example, he selected the characters to play the parts of the Mongolian and Russian partisans from among men who had actually served in the liberation of Mongolia under the banners of Sukhe-Bator, while for the famous ethnographical scenes he shot thousands of metres of religious ceremonies performed by lamas in an existing monastery. At the same time, he did not abandon his principle of long and painstaking preparation of his characters. At its best his style of work was illustrated in the scene of the execution of the Mongolian hero Bair by a British soldier, a scene which Pudovkin still considers to be among the most successful passages in all his work in cinema.

The world-wide success of this picture was followed by a period of failure. Between 1928 and 1939 Pudovkin made three films, *An Ordinary Event*, *The Deserter* and *Victory*, none of which met with the approval of the public. Today, his biographers attribute his run of failures to his retreat from realism into a maze of theorising based partly on his experiments with purely formal and technical devices and partly on the conviction he then held that to create a full emotional effect the subject-matter of a film should be relegated to the background. Experiments in using different speeds of shooting, a search for "poetic" images, and a preference for a mass of episodes (*The Deserter*, for example, contained three thousand) led Pudovkin to a position where he had all but forfeited the respect of the public. He was not alone in this position. Eisenstein and Alexandrov had failed signally in *The General Line*. Between the public and the most experienced film-directors there lay a gap.

In an article published in 1939 Alexandrov described a meeting with Stalin to which he and Eisenstein were summoned after their failure. "You workers in the cinema", Stalin said, "have no idea how much responsibility rests on you. You must take a serious attitude towards every movement, every word of your heroes. Remember that millions of people will pass judgment on it. You must not invent types and events as you sit alone in your offices. You must take them from life, you must study life. Learn from life . . . and to analyse correctly what you see, you must know Marxism. It seems to me that our artists' understanding of the great force of Marxism is still insufficient."



IN 1938 Eisenstein's film *Alexander Nevsky* appeared on the Soviet screen, as part of the cycle of historical films made in the late 1930's. Of this genre Pudovkin has written: "The masters of Soviet cinema oriented themselves above all on representing the people, the social activities of historical personages, on mirroring the connection between them and the popular masses and their understanding of the progressive trends of their epoch." He himself returned

from the scientific and lecturing work he had devoted himself to after the failure of *Victory*, to screen *Minin and Pozharsky*. With boundless energy he threw himself into a study of the history of the early seventeenth century, when these two patriotic figures arose to liberate Moscow from the Polish invaders. He saw his task to consist in a radical reinterpretation of history in the light of the observations on the teaching of history made by Stalin, with the assistance of Zhdanov and Kirov, in 1934. The unscientific work of Pokrovsky and his school had presented Minin and Pozharsky as counter-revolutionary characters, and the usurper Dmitri, who entered Russia with the invaders, as representing the revolutionary peasantry. Pudovkin rejected this tendentious reading of history.

He portrayed Minin not only as a brave soldier but as the organiser of an army and a statesman head-and-shoulders above Pozharsky, a man with his roots in the feudal past. The realistic portrayal of these characters owed much to Pudovkin's application of a maxim of Stanislavsky's during his work with his actors. He insisted on his script-writer providing full biographies of the main characters, arguing that he could not expect actors to bring their roles to life unless they knew their habits, beliefs and personal foibles. Nor did Pudovkin confine this approach to the main characters alone. His crowd is never impersonal, but consists of individuals who spring to life as the cameras catch them.

From work on this film, Pudovkin immediately turned to a biographical picture on the life of Suvorov. As before, he had to discard a mass of anecdote and false historical theory before he could reach the true character of the central figure and portray him as the architect of a Russian military tradition superior to that of Prussia. To act Suvorov he chose a virtually unknown and elderly actor, and by once again using Stanislavsky's method induced in him a complete and rounded understanding of the role.

The filming of the spectacular climax to *Suvorov*, when the Russian army is shown escaping from a trap by scaling the Alps, presented extraordinary difficulties. Pudovkin has described his work on this part of the film in the following words: "We had 1,500 costumes, guns, rifles and a big supply of pyrotechnical material brought from Moscow to a point in the Caucasus mountains not far from Kazbek. We selected a site 2,200 metres high for our camp. The wardrobe, and some 1,500 officers and men, stayed at a village in the valley below. From here we had to move everything about a kilometre every day to the shooting site, where a superb view over the mountain tops opens up. Then some two hundred of the best-trained soldiers, accompanied by my assistants, the cameramen and myself, crossed a glacier. The soldiers used their own system of signalling to maintain contact in the mountains. Although N. P. Cherkasov, playing the part of Suvorov, was over sixty years old, he took part in the most dangerous and fatiguing scenes, one of which included mounting a horse which we brought up the mountains with great difficulty. As many as 2,200 infantrymen and cavalymen took part in some scenes. We had to show a number of French soldiers falling into the river from the cliff-tops. This we did with dummies that were later swept away by the river Terek."



AFTER the outbreak of war, the Moscow film studies were evacuated to Alma Ata in Kazakhstan, where together with the Leningrad studios and the Moscow State Institute of Cinematography they were temporarily housed in part of the University. Here Pudovkin filmed *In the Name of the Fatherland* (from Konstantin Simonov's play *The Russians*) and a series of short anti-fascist films based on short stories by Berthold Brecht. In 1944 Pudovkin returned to Moscow. Soon after the end of the war he began work on *Admiral Nakhimov*.

Handicapped by a script which in its first version imposed an artificially

constructed personal intrigue on a story intended above all to show the great Russian admiral's power of will and thought, Pudovkin drew down on himself in September 1946 the criticism of the Central Committee of the Communist Party. The temptation to "soften" Nakhimov's character was a strong one, for he was a man whose interests were entirely absorbed by his service in the navy. But by injecting a romantic flavour into the film, and particularly by omitting the conflict of personalities between Nakhimov and his chief antagonists the Turkish admiral Osman Pasha and the British Lord Raglan, the writer of the first version of the script, Lukovsky, robbed the actor chosen for Nakhimov of the opportunity to plumb the depths of the admiral's character. In its final version the picture was acclaimed as Pudovkin's best, and won recognition both inside the Soviet Union and abroad.

How much Pudovkin benefited from the criticism of the first version of *Admiral Nakhimov* was more fully shown in his next work, for which he chose the life of Nikolai Zhukovsky, father of the science of aerodynamics. As we have seen, the filming of the birth of a scientific idea was a task for which Pudovkin felt himself to be especially well equipped. In this picture he concentrated not on showing a series of episodes from the scientist's life, but on showing how Zhukovsky, in his research, found the clue to the way of proving his conviction that man would master air as he had mastered water, by the strength not of his muscles but of his powers of reason. His experience with *Admiral Nakhimov* taught Pudovkin not to be afraid of tackling the most unpromising subject. It taught him, too, how much exciting dramatic conflict was to be extracted from showing the clash between conservatism and progress over the validity of an idea.

Pudovkin has not started work on a new film since his success with *Zhukovsky*, though he is considering a script based on a recent novel on collective-farm life, *Harvest*, by Nikolayeva. He has assisted the young and promising Hungarian film industry, and has travelled widely, in Britain, India, Italy and elsewhere, in the cause of peace and international understanding.

Not yet sixty years of age, Pudovkin has no doubt yet to make his best films, and one can look forward to them with a greater feeling of confidence than would have been justified at any earlier period in his career. Not that he has ceased to develop: his active, inquiring mind is never at rest, but he has attached himself firmly to certain principles that he is not likely to abandon. They are his own contributions to Soviet cinema. First and foremost of these is the high value he attaches to the work of the actor as artist. As a creator of character he is unrivalled. Second is his insistence on long and serious study of his material. He immerses himself in his subject. Finally, he clings to the belief that the film producer must express a point of view, must be a partisan of a progressive opinion concerning his subject, must advance this opinion in order to shape the mind of the public.

PUDOVKIN'S FILMS

1921	<i>Hammer and Sickle</i>	Assistant Director
1921	<i>Hunger . . . Hunger . . . Hunger</i>	Producer, Script-writer
1921	<i>The Carpenter and the Chancellor</i>	Script-writer
1924	<i>The Unusual Adventures of Mr. West in the Land of the Bolsheviki</i>	Art-director
1924-25	<i>The Death Ray</i>	Script-writer, Assistant Producer, Art-director
1925	<i>Chess Fever</i>	Producer
1925-26	<i>The Mechanism of the Brain</i>	Script-writer and Producer
1927	<i>The End of St. Petersburg</i>	Producer
1928	<i>The Heir of Genghiz Khan (Storm over Asia)</i>	Producer
1929-32	<i>An Ordinary Occasion (It's Very Good to Live)</i>	Producer
1933	<i>The Deserter</i>	Producer
1938	<i>Victory (The Happiest)</i>	Producer
1939	<i>Minin and Pozharsky</i>	Producer
1940	<i>The Cinema in the Twentieth Century</i>	Director
1941	<i>Suvorov</i>	Producer
1941	<i>The Feast at Zhirmunka (War Symposium No. 6)</i>	Producer
1941-42	<i>Murderers on the Warpath (The Face of Fascism)</i>	Script-writer and Producer
1943	<i>In the Name of the Motherland (The Russians)</i>	Producer, Script-writer
1947	<i>Admiral Nakhimov</i>	Producer
1950	<i>Zhukovsky</i>	Producer

S C R FILM SHOWS

The SCR London Students Branch are continuing their series of revivals of Soviet sound films at the Crown Theatre, 86 Wardour Street, W.1. The provisional programme at the time of going to press is :

January 30 - IVAN THE TERRIBLE
February 20 - MUSSORGSKY
March 12 - LERMONTOV

Particulars from SCR, or from David Fry, School of Slavonic Studies,
University of London, W.C.1

TRADE UNION ACTIVITY

IN SOVIET FACTORIES

WITH this number the ANGLO-SOVIET JOURNAL begins a series of representative translations from Soviet trade union journals, illustrating the practical everyday activities of trade unions in the USSR. The journal from which the three articles here presented are taken, *In Aid of Active Trade Unionists*, is a fortnightly publication of the Central Council of Trade Unions, with a circulation at present of 70,000.

I

A WORKS COMMITTEE REPORTS TO ITS MEMBERS

By V. Matveyev



AT the end of last year a new Works Committee was elected at the Serpukhov Machinery Works. Many active trade unionists were elected for the first time. P. N. Shemetillo, previously head of the machine shop, was elected chairman.

The job of the new Works Committee was to ensure fulfilment of the decisions of the annual general meeting, eliminate the defects for which the workmen had strongly criticised the previous committee leaders and organise the work of its commissions and of the active trade unionists better. Those active workers who had had experience in trade union work were able to give great help in this respect to the members of the Committee; and the bureau of the Party organisation gave day-to-day guidance to the Works Committee.

At meetings of the Committee and at general meetings of the workers and clerical staff, members of the Committee heard a good deal of criticism levelled at them. It helped them to correct their mistakes, settle rightly questions that arose, and improve their leadership.

In keeping with the requirements of the Central Council of Trade Unions that there should be regular reporting by trade union bodies to their members, the Works Committee decided to hold a general meeting for a report on all their activities during the preceding six months. Preparations for the meeting were discussed at the Works Committee, and members both of the Works and of the Shop Committees, as well as the trade union group organisers,* held talks in the shops about the agenda of the coming meeting.

On July 2, at the appointed time, nearly the whole manual and clerical staff were gathered for the meeting. You could feel that it had aroused a most lively interest.

In his report Comrade Shemetillo described in detail how the decisions of the annual general meeting and obligations under the collective agreement were being carried out. He paid particular attention to the work of the active trade union members in developing Socialist emulation for carrying out the 1951

* Such an organiser (unpaid) is elected by every group of twenty or more trade unionists at their place of work.

plan ahead of time. In the shops and departments, workers had concluded emulation agreements among themselves at the beginning of the year. Many had undertaken individual obligations. The group organisers, shop committees and the Works Committee itself were systematically supervising fulfilment of these undertakings. During the first six months forty-eight Stakhanovites had won the title of "best in their profession." Eighteen teams were recognised as "Excellent quality" teams. The trade union organisation took steps to see that the experience of those most successful in emulation should become known to all the workers.

But the management and the Works Committee have not yet succeeded in bringing about absolutely regular rhythm in the work of the personnel. The production programme is uneven in its fulfilment. During the first quarter the plans were completed every month, but in April and May the works did not fulfil its programme and remained in debt to the State. By stubborn work in June this debt in output had been covered; but now the workers have the job of consolidating their successes and ensuring rhythmical work. The shops which are lagging behind—the engineering and machine shops—must be helped to organise their planning and improve their mass training in production. The wages commission (chairman comrade Ulitin) does not give sufficient study to the state of affairs in the sections which fall behind.

Further, the chairman in his report dwelt in detail on educational work and recreation. The cultural organisers* and trade union group organisers hold regular newspaper readings and talks in the work-teams† and shop sections. This work has been particularly well organised in the foundry, where comrade Bykovsky is chairman of the shop committee.

The works still has no club of its own. It is therefore particularly important that the Red Corner‡ should work well. Last year it was neglected, and the annual general meeting demanded that the Works Committee should put this right. This request has been fulfilled. The Red Corner has been completely redecorated and refurnished. Glass cases have been put up containing material describing the activity of the works. Propaganda for advanced methods of work has been organised in the Corner, lectures are held, readers' conferences, chess tournaments, amateur arts performances. A string orchestra is now being organised. At the beginning of the summer the Works Committee arranged excursions to Moscow, to the Oka Natural Park, and to the Museum of the Russian Artist V. D. Polenov. At the request of the members, the Works Committee has set up a well-equipped pioneer camp of sanatorium type, capable of taking three relays of children, sixty at a time.

For the opening of the camp a new pavilion was built, other buildings repaired, household and sports equipment considerably renewed and extended, and games and musical instruments acquired for the children. The children are assured of good food and attention at the camp.

Further, the chairman dealt with what had been done to improve living conditions. The housing and living conditions commission, under comrade Kazakov, have done a good deal. The commission regularly supervises the building of the new block of flats and the condition of the existing houses. During the winter, members of the commission regularly checked the heating arrangements in houses belonging to the works and secured speedy elimination of defects.

The allotments commission has done a good deal for the workers. It managed this year to get an additional piece of land for the allotment-holders and thus to satisfy all requirements. The land on the individual allotments was

* A cultural organiser (voluntary, unpaid) is elected by every trade union group.

† In Russian, *brigada*, which does not mean "brigade."

‡ A recreation room in a factory, or space partitioned off for the purpose in a large department.

worked by tractors and horses. When vegetable sowings were in progress, holders were given transport facilities. The problem of the commission now is to help the workers in gathering in the harvest also.

Much attention has been paid by the Works Committee to the fulfilment of obligations for improving working conditions, under the collective agreement. The sums provided under the agreement for improving safety technique and labour protection are being satisfactorily used. New ventilation has already been installed in the foundry and blacksmith's shop and in the garage. A number of lavatories have been re-equipped; machinery for pneumatic and sand-blast cleaning of castings has been installed.

The annual general meeting called on the Works Committee to improve its work of organising and recruiting 100% membership. During recent months over a hundred have been brought into the Union. However, there are still twenty-nine manual and clerical workers outside it. The Works Committee took steps to raise the knowledge and extend the experience in trade union work of the active members. Seminars were organised for the chairmen of shop committees and for members of the following commissions: housing and living conditions, labour protection and wages. The Works Committee also held two consultations with the chairmen of shop committees and trade union group organisers.

After the report a lively discussion developed. Many agreed that during the half-year the new Works Committee had managed to make noticeable improvements in trade union work at the plant. But the main job of the meeting was to concentrate attention on problems that had not yet been solved, and to point out ways of further improving the work of the trade union organisation. And the meeting did this job in full measure. Every aspect of the activity of the organisation was subjected to sharp Bolshevik criticism.

"In his report", said N. Lednyov, charge-hand of the turners, "comrade Shemetillo has rightly criticised the shop committee in the machine shop. But what help did the Works Committee give us when we were falling behind? Did it discuss the reasons? Did it consult with us how to overcome the defects more rapidly and eliminate the bottlenecks? No, it never consulted us. The commissions for workers' inventions and rationalisation is doing nothing at all."

V. Zhdanov, who works in the personnel department, said the Works Committee was not doing much to ensure proper publicity for Socialist emulation.

"Walk through the Works", he said, "and you will see that the indexes of fulfilment of obligations are displayed in different ways in the different shops. In the foundry they have up fresh figures for the second half of June, while in the pattern-making and tool shops all they have on the board are old figures for May. If we only find out a month late how a given machine-operator has been working, what's the use? It is essential that everyone should know both of good and of bad work by every workman the very next day. The Works Committee must see that this is done."

Some of the speakers pointed out that the Works Committee was paying little attention to the young people. "Many of those who finish the works apprentice school are still not reaching their quota of output", said carpenter Nekrasov. "Their working discipline is poor. The Works and shop committees ought to give daily attention to the training of the young workers."

The meeting subjected the organisation and mass work of the Works Committee to sharp criticism. Speakers pointed out that the Works Committee and the shop committees were relying on too narrow a circle of active trade unionists. Proper instruction and training had not been organised for them.

"Comrade Shemetillo tries to do everything himself", said comrade Bogdanov, secretary of the Party bureau at the works. "Yet some members of the Works Committee, for example comrade Shalaginov, who is in charge of

the commission on workers' inventions and rationalisation, don't do any work at all."

Thus supplementing one another, the workers pointed out the main and most vital defects in the activity of the Works Committee. In its resolution the meeting pointed out the practical steps the Committee should take to raise the level of trade union work, and to give more effective aid to the Works collective in fulfilling their Socialist undertakings.

The meeting proved most instructive to the members of the Works and shop committees and to all the active trade unionists. They were shown once again how vigilantly the whole body of workers at the plant follows their every step, and what great interest it displays in all the activities of the trade union. The meeting equipped the Works Committee and the active trade union members with a practical programme for eliminating the shortcomings it had revealed.

—*Abridged from V POMOSHCH PROFSOYUZNOMU AKTIVU*, 14, 1951 (July)

2

HOW WE IMPROVE TEXTILE WORKERS' CONDITIONS

By L. Yanushkovskaya

(*Senior social inspector of labour protection at the Trekhgornaya (F. E. Dzerzhinsky) Combined Textile Mills, Moscow.*)



Two years ago at our combined mills there began a remarkable patriotic movement for more civilised conditions in production, on the initiative of Vladimir Voroshin, an assistant charge-hand. Our workers have managed to do a great deal in this respect. Take the factory yard, for example—it has been asphalted and planted with trees and lawns. There is a fountain playing and flower beds are laid out, where the textile workers can rest in their free time if they like.

For a long time one of the sore points in our mills was the shops with a high degree of humidity. Here, too, model conditions have been created. Instead of the dirty barrels from which the workers got their lubricating oil, special cisterns with water gauges have been set up, and the greasers get the necessary lubricating materials in special vessels. Little cupboards have been set up in the shops to hold the oil containers, which makes it possible to use lubricating oils both tidily and economically. The whole question had previously been discussed at a meeting of the Factory Committee, on the initiative of the lubricating workers themselves and of comrade Alyapin, head of our oil department.

The bad spots in the glue-boiling and bleaching departments have also been eliminated. All the work here has been mechanised. Our workmen say nowadays: "It's as clean here as in a confectionery factory."

In this improvement of working conditions no small part has been played by the trade union organisations and the voluntary active workers supporting them. There is a labour protection commission at our combined mills, numbering thirteen members, which guides the work of the commissions working in each of the seven mills. The chairmen of these commissions are members of the combined mills commission. In addition, the commission includes the head of the medical and sanitary department of our mills and the safety engineer. With their help, the commission gets the necessary measures for improving working conditions carried out more rapidly.

We began our work by distributing duties among members of the commission. Each was given one branch of the work—ventilation, protective devices, sanitary and living conditions, safety technique, drinking-water, and so on.

We work on a quarterly plan, the main point of which is supervising how the labour protection agreement and the appropriate provisions in the works collective agreement are being carried out. In addition, we always include additional questions in our plan. Thus, when at the end of last year an outbreak of influenza was registered in the spinning mill, we included in our plan a study of the reason for this. Members of our commission, social inspectors, and representatives of the medical and sanitary department went round the shops. They found several things wrong. For example, in order to get to the canteen, our working women had to pass through the staircase shaft, which was next door to the factory porch. The porch was not heated, and the cold draughts were causing illness. We got the management to heat the porch and vestibule, and when this was done the colds rapidly ceased.

The labour protection commission leaves no case of industrial accident uninvestigated. It ascertains the reasons and analyses them, and secures working conditions which completely eliminate any possibility of repetition.

We draw up our plan, taking into account the remarks and suggestions of the mill commissions. Take for example the weaving mill, where accidents may take place through shuttles flying out. The commission put down in its quarterly plan the question of the shuttle-controlling appliance. As a result, last year we got more than 2,000 of these controlling appliances repaired, and as a result we have not had a single accident.

Measures for mechanising production play a prominent part in our plan: the introduction of mechanical packers and gasket winders, which have done away with laborious operations, and also the introduction of hundreds of little carriers constructed by the engineers of our mill, which have lightened the work of the women engaged in moving the finished goods.

In carrying out our plan our social inspectors* play an active part. The majority of them are veteran workers who have been many years at the mills. Comrades Krasikov, Dedicheva and Pavlov are examples: the latter has worked for forty-three years as an erector, and for fifteen years has been an inspector of labour protection. These social inspectors are enthusiastic at their jobs and are deservedly respected.

M. V. Krasikov has been working at this job for ten years, and has had great experience. His characteristic is that he never passes over anything that a social inspector ought to notice. In the spring of 1951 the electrically operated pulley in the printing mill broke, and the workmen had to lift the goods by hand. Comrade Krasikov drew the attention of the management to this, and was told that the machine could not be mended because there was no cable. So our social inspector wrote an article for *The Cotton Print Worker*, the mill wall-newspaper, in which he criticised comrade Shub, the manager. His intervention produced the desired effect: the pulley was rapidly put right.

I must draw attention to the experience of comrade Dedicheva, the social inspector who is a greaser in our finishing mill. By listening attentively to the workers' opinions, proposals and complaints, she has made many valuable suggestions. On one occasion she noticed that the women were cleaning the machinery while it was still hot. This might lead to an accident, she decided: special approaches ought to be installed. The inspector requested the shop manager to arrange flooring over the hot cylinders. When the flooring had been installed the work became absolutely safe. Now her proposal has been widely applied in all the drying sheds.

The social inspector needs to have a good knowledge of labour legislation and production technique, for only on this condition can he make the right

* A social (voluntary, unpaid) inspector of labour is elected by every trade union group of twenty or more workers. He or she has full powers of investigation, and reports to the senior social inspector, who in turn can close a department or prosecute the management, if need be, through the Works Committee or full-time factory inspector, for breach of regulations.

demands on the management. We have therefore organised seminars for the inspectors at our mills. Owing to shift work we were not able to draw all our active workers into these studies; so we have worked out a time-table of seminars which provides for each shift.

With the help of its social inspectors, the combined mills labour protection commission has done a great deal to check fulfilment of the 1950 collective agreement, and has collected workers' suggestions for the 1951 agreement. Suggestion boxes were hung up in all the departments, and the wishes expressed at general meetings and conferences were also noted. All the material thus gathered was then presented to the Works Committee, which informed the management of what the workers desired. The most important proposals were included in the labour protection agreement.* The dates for introducing other proposals, not included in the agreement, were fixed by the director in a special order. Our commission established strict supervision over the fulfilment of the workers' wishes. For example, the workers in the printing mill asked that wash-basins with hot water should be set up in their shop, and the commission supported this proposal. It was included in the labour protection agreement and carried out in two months.

Here is another fact that is symptomatic. A group of women engaged in transporting fabrics drew the attention of the commission to irregularities in the flooring, caused by the great heat, which were hampering the movement of the carriers. In spite of expressions of public opinion and a letter from the shop manager, the building department of our Combine did nothing about it. So our commission approached the Works Committee with a request that the necessary conditions of labour be created for the women on the carriers. The Works Committee made it obligatory on the management to meet the complaint immediately: and the floors in all departments were put right.

Public control in production is a great force. The opinion of members of the labour protection commission and of its social inspectors is listened to, and their advice is considered: this is already a guarantee of success. The "suggestions book for social inspectors", which we recently introduced on the advice of the Central Committee of the Textile Workers' Union, disciplines our management and raises their sense of responsibility for observing the regulations for safety technique and industrial health.

In cases of a neglectful attitude on the part of the management towards the requirements of labour protection, serious conclusions are drawn. Thus, for example, it was on the insistence of the labour protection commission that comrade Zaitsev, head of the printing shop, was reduced to the rank of foreman for not having ensured the strict observance of safety technique. The question of the breaches of regulations in this shop was discussed at a meeting of the Works Committee, in the presence of all the engineers and technicians of the combined mills, the social inspectors and members of the mill labour protection commissions.

We have succeeded in arranging for regular instruction in safety technique in every shop. The instruction is carried out by foremen or shop managers, under the supervision of the social inspectors. This form of work has enabled us to improve control by public opinion over the quality of the training given, and has raised the authority of the social inspector in the eyes of the workers.

The experience of the labour protection commission at the Trekhgornaya Mills shows that we have unlimited possibilities; and we could have done incomparably more. But there are still frequent cases when individual managers, and even the Works Committee, underestimate the importance of the commis-

* A labour protection agreement is concluded by management and union committee in each factory. It is supplementary to the general collective agreement for that factory, which contains only the main provisions for labour (health and safety) protection: these are determined in much greater detail in the special labour protection agreement.

sion and pay little attention to questions of labour protection. It is sufficient to say that this year the Works Committee has so far only once taken a report from the commission. The Works Committee ought to give daily guidance to the commission in its activities, bring up important questions, and help in organising training and in exchanging experience among the social inspectors, which would supply answers to many questions that arise.

—From *V POMOSHCH PROFSOYUZNOMU AKTIVU*, 15, 1951 (August).

3

THE FACTORY COMMITTEE MEETING

By A. Vasiliev



WHEN the agenda for a meeting of the Factory Committee at the “Red October” confectionery factory (Moscow) is being drawn up, considerable preparatory work is done. Before any question is put down for discussion, Varvara Ivanovna Sergeyeva, chairman of the Factory Committee, consults with members of the committee, trade union active members and the secretary of the Party committee. Her constant contact with the chairmen of shop committees makes her aware of all departmental trade union affairs. The agenda for meetings of the Factory Committee is one of the items in the month’s plan of work of all trade union organisations at the factory.

On one occasion comrade Sergeyeva went into the transport department. After the dazzlingly white and strikingly clean production shops, the rubbish and the grey walls in the garage depressed her. Questions of more civilised and healthy production conditions had more than once been discussed at meetings in all departments and trade union groups. The transport workers had passed lengthy resolutions too, but there had been no results. Sergeyeva had a long talk with comrade Zolotaryov, chairman of the shop committee in the transport department. He told her in detail about what was being done in the shop, but could not explain just why the decisions of general meetings were not being carried out.

Varvara Ivanovna began talking with the drivers, the loaders, and the trade union active members, and realised that she knew little about what was going on in the shop. On looking through the minutes of the general meetings, she noticed that the same people were speaking every time. Resolutions were drawn up in a hurry and contained many generalities. The workers were not making their own proposals. “What’s the use of making any?” said one of the loaders sourly. “They never get carried out anyway.”

The chairman of the Factory Committee decided to put down the question of the work of the shop committee in the transport department on the agenda of the Factory Committee. She discussed her ideas with other members of the Committee, and they supported her. Their plan included a check on the work of the shop committee concerned.

According to established tradition, careful preparations for the meeting of the Factory Committee began. Comrades Kolosova and Pospelov—chairmen of the shop committees in the chocolate and packing departments respectively—were given the job of investigating the work of the transport department, so as to be able to make co-reports at the meeting. Other members of the Factory Committee also visited the transport department; this was not only to investigate: they helped the shop committee with their advice and experience. Notice of the forthcoming meeting was given in good time to all members of the Factory Committee, chairmen of shop committees and trade union active members. Many had grievances against the transport department; the meeting

was therefore a crowded one. All members of the shop committee of the transport department were present.

Their reporter, comrade Zolotaryov, was obviously nervous. He had to tell the meeting of the many-sided activity of the shop committee—how Socialist emulation in the department was organised, how decisions of general meetings and workers' suggestions had been carried out, how mass cultural work was being done and so forth.

In his report, comrade Zolotaryov took note of the opening remarks by comrade Sergeyeva, in which she had said that he should not evade sore points, and that he was to give a profound analysis of defects and to show the reasons that were interfering with the work of the department.

Having described the work of the shop committee, comrade Zolotaryov made serious complaints against the work of the Factory Committee, which had concentrated all its attention on the production departments and had forgotten all about the transport workers. Leaders of the Factory Committee rarely looked in, and gave no practical help to the shop committee.

"We live like a remote hamlet; it is very rare that anyone looks in even as a guest", said the chairman of the shop committee. "They curse us on the phone because the lorries haven't turned up in time, and that's all."

The co-reporters, comrades Kolosova and Pospelov, tore to pieces—as they say—the activity of the shop committee and comrade Zolotaryov. They drew attention to the fact that the shop committee had ceased to be an organ of collective leadership. Comrade Zolotaryov was trying to do everything himself, and not drawing members of the committee into active work.

Meetings of the shop committee and general meetings of the members were bored and listless. This was because the chairman of the shop committee never thought over the agenda which he was putting down for discussion. Members of the shop committee were given the same routine questions for discussion—material aid to individual workers, or the particular action recommended by the Factory Committee at the moment. The shop committee had not once gathered to have a talk about how best to prepare for the next meeting, and how to ensure active participation by the workers in discussing the proposed agenda. Yet meetings ought to be a school of Bolshevik upbringing for the manual and clerical workers.

Members of the Factory Committee—comrades Minenko, Lyande, Yudin—spoke in the discussion. Each of them made practical suggestions about one branch or another of the work of the shop committee. They spoke of the poor registration of the results of Socialist emulation, at the same time showing from their own experience how publicity for emulation could best be organised. Analysing in detail the methods adopted at production conferences,* they gave advice on how the faults revealed could be put right.

Comrade Pook, trade union group organiser in the chocolate department, gave her ideas on the work of group organisers in the transport department. Comrade Biburov, manager of the department, admitted that in his practical work he relied little on the help of the shop committee.

In her speech comrade Sergeyeva dwelt particularly on the way to organise general meetings in the shop. She tried to show what ought to be done to ensure that the meetings were conducted on a high level of political principle, and what questions ought to be put to the workers for discussion (such as making better known the experience of the 100,000 kilometre drivers, better methods of work for drivers, improvement of mass cultural activities, and so on). "At the present time", she said, "it is very important to the transport department to take steps to strengthen working discipline, and the efforts of the trade union

* Production conferences are meetings of work teams, shops and whole factories (in larger factories taking the form of delegate conferences) at which problems of production are discussed by workers, technicians and management.

organisation ought to be directed towards this." She described how the shop committee ought to prepare for the general meeting, and how the active members should be drawn into organising it. The main thing was to get more activity at the meetings themselves, and to organise a struggle for the fulfilment of decisions taken, drawing trade union organisers and all active members into the practical work of the shop committee.

This well-prepared meeting of the factory committee turned into a kind of school on trade union work. The speakers expressed many interesting ideas and made valuable proposals. The chairman of the shop committee was advised to visit the caramel department and study the experience of trade union work there.

A comprehensive resolution gave practical indications to the shop committee on how to improve its work.

Zolotaryov left the meeting with his mind more at rest. He felt confident in himself. This severe but just criticism at the hands of his comrades had helped him to a better understanding of how to make the whole work of the shop committee more purposeful.

This was how the activity of the trade union organisation in a backward shop was discussed at the Factory Committee. During the year nine shop committees have reported on their work at its meetings. On each report practical decisions have been taken which have borne in mind the particular features in the work of each department. On the reports of the chairmen of the shop committees in the caramel and retail departments, the Factory Committee have decided to make their experience available to the trade union organisations in other shops.

Once a month the meetings of the Factory Committee are particularly stormy. They are attended not only by its members and by trade union active members, but also by departmental managers, engineers and foremen. The agenda includes the item: "Summing up the results of Socialist emulation during the past month and determining the first place in the emulation by trades." These meetings are particularly carefully prepared, and members of the production commission and wages commission are particularly active in this respect. Every index is taken into account when determining first place, including economy in raw materials and electric power, and with special attention to quality of output.

The agenda of the Factory Committee is as varied as the life of the body of workers at the factory which it reflects.

Many Soviet factories have taken up the initiative of the *Burevestnik* (Stormy Petrel) factory for reducing costs of production in each operation. The Factory Committee at "Red October" discussed this striking movement and itself took steps to organise it at this factory. In particular, it was decided to organise economic studies for the active rank-and-file trade unionists. It worked out, jointly with the latter and with the technicians, practical steps to carry out the decisions of the sixth session of the Central Council of Trade Unions on better guidance of Socialist emulation.

Once a month, as a rule, the Factory Committee discusses the questions of trade union membership and of the fulfilment of the plan in respect of collecting membership dues.

All members of the Factory Committee take part in putting forward questions for discussion at its meetings. The deputy chairman, comrade Minenko, is in charge of the production commission. This commission initiates questions of developing Socialist emulation, improving the work of production conferences, extending the experience of innovators, and so on.

A new block of flats for the workers and employees of the "Red October" factory is being built in Bolshaya Kaluzhskaya Street. The Factory Committee knows the time table for every part of the work. Comrade Osipova, a member

of the Committee, is a frequent visitor to the site. When there was a danger that the plan was going to break down, she proposed that the Factory Committee should discuss this question. The housing and living conditions commission prepared a detailed report which revealed the reasons obstructing completion of the job. It was on the initiative of this commission also that the preparation of the hostels for the winter season was discussed.

The agenda often includes questions of mass cultural work, such as, for example, the work of the amateur art circle which has recently been discussed. The Factory Committee noted the successes of the talented youngsters, gave prizes to the best among them and at the same time pointed out defects in the organisation of training.

Frequent visitors at meetings of the Factory Committee are the officials of the sports club. The Committee pays serious attention to the development of physical culture and sport.

Complaints from the workers are carefully examined at meetings of the Committee. The technical side is also well looked after : members of the Committee and active trade unionists get good notice of the day and hour of meetings, draft resolutions are carefully prepared, and minutes are sent out quickly.

Decisions of the Factory Committee are the fruit of collective leadership, of a programme of practical activities for the whole trade union organisation and particularly for the commissions, shop committees and trade union group organisers. The Committee is constantly concerned for the effectiveness of the decisions adopted. The fulfilment of earlier decisions is frequently an item on the agenda of its discussions.

—Abridged from *V POMOSHCH PROFSOYUZNOMU AKTIVU*, 20, 1951 (October).

BOOK REVIEWS

THE NEW BIOLOGY OF THE SOVIET UNION

THREE years have elapsed since the memorable session of the Lenin Academy of Agricultural Sciences at which the overwhelming majority of Soviet biologists came out in support of Michurin biology. Now at last we have a book in English, by Dr. Alan Morton,* which gives an account of the scientific data and practical experiences which led to that decision. Although, as Dr. Morton states, his book is only an introduction to a vast and growing subject, it is both well balanced and well written and deserves to be regarded as the most serious and painstaking treatment of Soviet biology yet to appear in this country.

For the biologist, the most valuable section of *Soviet Genetics* is the chapter entitled "Changing the Nature of Plants." Here Morton, by working through the original papers, is able to present the experimental evidence so often demanded by the Mendelians for the transformation of winter into spring wheats and other work along similar lines. It transpires that once details of this work (such as the critical time scale of the vernalising treatments) are known, the favourite alternative explanations, mixed seed and selection, can no longer be sustained.† These are indeed directed transformations.

Unfortunately, the account of the change of species from hard to soft wheat, by overwintering for three years, is less complete. Yet Morton's review of this topic is sufficient to dispel any doubts about the competence and good faith of the workers concerned. This work fits into a general treatment of Lysenko's concept of "shaken heredity" and the experiments cited leave no room for doubt about the reality of this condition or about the suitability of the adjective "shaken" to describe it.

Separate chapters of the book are devoted to work on graft hybrids and fertilisation. Here too one is impressed by the evidence of many-sided and original research, yielding results which confront Mendelian geneticists with the gravest difficulties. Yet it would be wrong to suggest that the aim of all this work was simply to provide arguments for undermining Mendelism. The experiments and the views to which they gave birth were alike the outcome of a programme of

practical work in which the aim was to provide Soviet agriculture with new kinds of organisms and new methods of employing them. It is against this background of the practical problems that agronomy was placing before Soviet geneticists that Morton quite rightly begins and ends his book. And, of course, when practical experience was raising doubts about the correctness of Mendel-Morganism as a general theory of heredity in all its aspects, it is not surprising that Mendelism was itself subjected to a critical re-examination in philosophical terms. Morton develops this aspect of Soviet genetics in a chapter entitled "The Theory of the Gene," a chapter which can only be described as a brilliant answer to those who want to know why the genetics controversy is at rock bottom a philosophical and ideological question.

Two years ago Julian Huxley published a book with an almost identical title (*Soviet Genetics and World Science**) to that of the one here reviewed. Anyone wishing to arrive at the truth about the issues raised by Lysenko's work could hardly do better than to read and compare these two works. Practically every argument advanced by Huxley for doubting the validity of the Michurinist results—and that is the essence of his attitude—finds its answer in Morton's account of the experimental and practical work. If the Mendelians have other explanations than Lysenko's for these results they are entitled to put them forward. But the main Mendelian reply so far, that there are no Michurinist results, that it is all a wicked ideological campaign organised by the Politburo for dubious (and inexplicable) political reasons, can no longer be upheld.

Without doubt one of the most important tasks facing those who desire to strengthen cultural ties with the Soviet Union is to ensure a wide circulation for this admirable book. Sections of our scientific press may attempt to ignore it, damn it with faint praise or smear it. I hope that all readers of this journal, and especially the scientists, will buy it, read it and push it in every way they can. In so doing they will be striking a real blow for peace between our two countries and disposing of one of the biggest of the many lies which are disrupting British-Soviet cultural relations.

D. M. ROSS.

*SOVIET GENETICS. By Alan G. Morton (*Lawrence and Wishart*, 15/-).

†See Lysenko's article in *ANGLO-SOVIET JOURNAL*, Vol. XII, No. 1 (*Spring* 1951).

*See review-article in *ANGLO-SOVIET JOURNAL*, Vol. xi, No. 2 (*Summer* 1950).

DOCUMENTARY EVIDENCE

THE Editor, and the Royal Institute of International Affairs, have brought out the fullest collection* of Soviet foreign policy documents so far published in this country. The volume under review, which covers the years 1917-1924, is part of a series intended "to provide for those unfamiliar with the Russian language but pursuing studies . . . of Soviet foreign policy, a sufficient number of documents to indicate its main preoccupations and to illustrate its aims and diplomatic techniques". It includes notes and manifestos, statements and speeches by leading statesmen, decrees, reports to and resolutions of the Congress or the Central Executive Committee of Soviets, and several treaty texts. The range of sources is wide (though one wonders why the 1922-25 edition of Lenin's works was used instead of the most recent one), and the subject-matter extensive. The British student without command of Russian now has some solid raw material to work on.

But he will have to do so with caution. A three-volume issue of a world power's foreign policy papers for almost twenty-five years cannot but be selective. We are warned by Miss Degras that there are gaps; unfortunately, these are serious. Apart from the omission of treaties essential for a proper perspective of Soviet motives in given historical settings (such as the 1917 Armistice Agreements with the Central Powers), there is a marked neglect of Lenin's and Stalin's pronouncements on international affairs. This is all the more astonishing in view of the attention paid to Trotsky (whose cardinal divergences from Leninist policy are overlooked), not only as Foreign Commissar but even after his removal from the Narkomindel (pp. 95, 345, 375).

Lenin's statements, on the other hand, are limited to five, and Stalin's to one. Most of these, moreover, are reduced to extracts. Thus, Lenin's *Report of May 14, 1918*, which in the Russian edition has seventeen pages, is shortened to less than two. His speech of October 2, 1920 (the Editor mistakenly puts the date as October 8), is cut from thirteen pages to just under three; and so on. Even allowing for the differences of type and page-size, this is plainly inadequate. While the documents that are given of course reflect his and the Communist Party's directives, the collection suffers from the lack of Lenin's

and Stalin's incisive analyses of international situations and their practical deductions therefrom. Since Soviet foreign policy is rooted in theory, it is impossible to gain a full understanding of its manifestations without integrating them with the utterances of the two greatest twentieth-century exponents of Marxism. Stalin's *Peace with Germany; Light from the East; Two Camps; Reserves of Imperialism; A New Entente Offensive; Results of the 13th Party Congress; On the International Situation*; and other such works (*Sochineniya Stalina, Vols. 4-6*) and the relevant sections, too numerous to be mentioned here, in *Vols. 26-35* of the fourth Russian Edition of Lenin's works, are basic to a high-standard collection of Soviet foreign policy documents.

Nor is the translation, though it reads well in English, sufficiently exact. A comparison, for instance, of Lenin's speech on p. 79 with the original on pp. 341-2 of the Russian edition reveals unacknowledged omissions of important words or sentences. On p. 224 Lenin is made to say: "We cannot attempt to put this plan [of electrification. *W.G.*] into operation without the help of foreign capital and means of production." Actually his words were (*fourth R. Edition, Vol. 31, p. 424*): "We cannot accelerate the fulfilment of this plan without . . .", etc. And there are other misrenderings of the original.

Nevertheless the book is valuable as documentary evidence that the foreign policy of the USSR represents a new type of international conduct. Not one of the assembled 250 papers contains a word in favour of armaments, power groupings, diplomatic blackmail, or war. They tell the story of the first seven years of the Socialist State, its struggle against intervention, interference and isolation, for survival and consolidation. A realistic appraisal of difficulties is blended with confidence; a hard-hitting pungency of method and style with conciliatoriness and concession; inflexibility of strategy with tactical elasticity (for example, the exchanges with President Wilson or Lord Curzon). The keynote is negotiation, trade, disarmament, co-operation. The underlying characteristic is consistency of principle.

Those who dismiss the present Soviet peace campaign as opportunistic propaganda are reminded on page one and later that the Soviet Government's first international act was the Peace Decree. The statement to the British Prime Minister in February 1924 that "friendly co-operation between the peoples of Great Britain and the USSR remained one of the first cares of the Government of the Union" (p. 426) is as alive today as it was over a quarter of a century ago.

W.G.

*SOVIET DOCUMENTS ON FOREIGN POLICY. Selected and edited by Jane Degras. Vol. 1, 1917-1924. Issued under the auspices of the Royal Institute of International Affairs. (*Oxford University Press, 42/-*.)

A TENDENTIOUS WORK

THE diversity of Russian political thought in the nineteenth century is a subject still insufficiently known to large circles. Nor would anyone take exception to an attempt* at discovering the seeds of the present in the past experience of the Russian people. Some of the actual quotations from less familiar works, translated by the Hon. R. Hare from the Russian, may have some interest, but the accompanying commentaries are obviously vitiated by the author's preconceived ideas. Being scattered throughout his book, they have the appearance of conclusions drawn from the texts quoted, whereas even the author's selection seems to have been conditioned by his general views. To prop up his aversion to the Soviet regime, it seems as though he would like to show that Russians have ever been a slavish, self-glorifying people, barbarous and uninventive.

The general pattern of the author's reasoning can be illustrated by the passage on that rather fantastic writer of the extreme right, K. Leontiev (1831-1891), whom he considers almost as his own discovery. He writes (p. 302) that if we replace a Tsar by a "deified leader" and "the moral authority of the Orthodox state-church by a fanatical social creed of German-Jewish origin . . . then a broad picture emerges which bears some formal resemblance to Leontiev's forecast."

In the long history of any nation one can find cases of stinging self-criticism, sometimes engendered by suffering, sometimes by a constructive wish for improvements; but Mr. Hare collects his quotations only as admissions and avowals, without reference to the social and political conditions that explain them. He sees only one of the two fencers, and photographs only his odd reactions. The Crimean War, or the results of the Berlin Congress in 1878, were naturally felt by contemporaries as painfully as were the interventions in the years following the October Revolution; this side of the evidence is not taken into consideration by the court presided over by the former head of the Russian Department of the Ministry of Information.

He disobligingly suggests that defeats were useful to the conceited Russians (p. 302): "The liberal period from 1856 until the revolution was marked by a series of military and political disasters for Russia, yet it saw the most splendid outburst of literature and music that she has ever known before or since. Squalid and arrogant in worldly triumph, individual Russians proved glorious in defeat, and

through defeat stronger in imaginative creation."

As if in connection with the advantages of defeatism, the author grumbles (p. 73) about the line of "nationalist evolution" in the Soviet Army, adding that "military smartness and the old Prussian discipline rose to a premium". Nor is the improvement in the relations between Church and State to his liking. By a very overstrained piece of reasoning he establishes a contact between the "heretic martyr Avvakum" (seventeenth century), the Slavophil Khomyakov, and the Soviet Union: "The fierce but essentially conservative tenacity of the sectarians and Old Believers, all fundamentally Slavophil by temperament . . . continues to echo in those eruptions of nostalgia, and in the more calculated xenophobia, which complicates the progress of the Soviet Union."

The reference to the industrialisation of the country "at breakneck speed" is sourly annotated: "The crusading ferocity, the heresy-hunting, the fanatical zeal, counterbalanced by a love of torture and casuistry, which distinguished medieval Christianity and reached its most Russian phase in the reign of Ivan the Terrible, seemed to come to life again in the twentieth century."

All these highly tendentious and characteristic statements will warn readers of this book (excellently produced, and patronised by the Rockefeller Foundation) not to take it as a purely academic contribution.

The only plate in the book represents a group of hearty nineteenth-century peasants dancing merrily to a *balalaika*—in the vein of the familiar poster "Even the Russians Have Their Bally Leica".

G.W.

NATURE'S CALENDAR

"IN no Russian writer", declared Gorky in a preface to Prishvin's works, "have I encountered or sensed such a harmonious combination of love for the earth and knowledge of her. . . . You know forests and marshes, fish and fowl, herbs, animals, dogs and insects, extraordinarily well—wonderfully rich and wide is the world known by you. And even more wonderful is the abundance of most simple and glowing words in which you embody your love for the Earth and for all that lives on it. . . ." Even at that time, a quarter of a century ago, Prishvin had a reputation of long standing. He was born in 1873; he published *The Land of Unafraid Birds* in 1907; and today he is still writing. In *Nature's Calendar** (*The Lake and the Woods* is the translator's title) he stands

*PIONEERS OF RUSSIAN SOCIAL THOUGHT. By R. Hare. Studies in Non-Marxian Formation in Nineteenth-century Russia and of its Partial Revival in the Soviet Union. (Oxford University Press, 25/-.)

*THE LAKE AND THE WOODS, or NATURE'S CALENDAR. By Mikhail Prishvin. Translated by W. L. Goodman, with wood-engravings by Brian Hope-Taylor. (Routledge and Kegan Paul, 21/-.)

before us as a man of fifty, exploring the wild life and the human scene in the marshes and forests of Central Russia when Soviet power was still new.

It is a strange world, where peasants still celebrate pagan rites, where the boatman is a priest out of work and happy to be so, and where eager young scientists are setting up field stations with more courage than experience. In the middle of it stands Prishvin, steeped in nature-lore, expert at training dogs and shooting game, a humorist and self-taught philosopher, at times a little opinionated, but always humane and sensitive. He has the gift Gorky recognised in him, of using the simplest words to suggest the very feel of what he describes, whether it be a sudden spring storm on the lake: a "white rainbow": a fox at bay: or his son Lyova, a tremendously keen novice on the archaeological expedition, turning up a skull—to the dismay of the peasant Nikolai, whose intelligent brother Pavel snubs him for having no conception of science.

Prishvin is not a mere naturalist, sportsman, or landscape artist; he brings a whole world alive, from the sticky birch leaf in spring to the Chairman of the District Committee who stood up for snakes, from the thoughts and feelings of his dog Yarik to the subtle gradations of spring and autumn.

Needless to say, this was no easy book to translate. Mr. Goodman's version reads attractively; he can convey the sights and sounds of the countryside in apt English words. But one has to admit that his respect for the Russian original is often scanty. A straw in the wind is the peculiar spelling: who feels confident on seeing "Nadyehda" (for Nadezhda) and "Solovya" (for Solovey)? And the place-names are mangled. Then closer inspection reveals countless freedoms, and downright errors: singulars for plurals, *sixty* instead of *sixteen*; the kind of mistake that brings the chilliest light into a schoolmaster's eye. In the last century they put up with such carelessness: the main thing was to get a glimpse, however imperfect, of the original. Today there is no longer the same excuse. We have the right to demand a wholly accurate translation, which with good dictionaries and expert advice is quite possible.

The woodcuts by Brian Hope-Taylor, though not specifically Russian in character, are pleasing. Despite its shortcomings in translation, this is a book to buy.

HENRY GIFFORD.

EYE-WITNESS REPORTS

A FEW months ago I visited the Soviet Union as one of a Quaker delegation whose main concern was the promotion of peace and mutual reconciliation between the Governments and peoples of the East and of the West. We were wel-

comed, and were given every opportunity—within the limits of our time—not only of talking to political and religious leaders, but also of observing for ourselves conditions of life in Moscow, Leningrad and Kiev, and on a collective farm near Kiev. On our return to England we were amazed to find what tremendous public interest there was in all that we had to say; and we were frequently told that this was because it was felt that we had tried to be fair and objective: people wanted to know the truth about Russia.

This comment is hardly fair or just to some of the other delegations who have also visited the Soviet Union and who have come back prepared to give an honest report of what they have seen and heard. The report of the British Trade Unionists,* for example, bears within itself the imprint of truth. This small booklet consists in the main of a series of short essays by the various members of the group, each describing and commenting on that aspect of the visit that interested him, or her, most. The style, therefore, is uneven; but it is obvious that every one of the delegation tried to be objective. Some may have been biased in favour of the communist regime, and they undoubtedly (and rightly) saw much to impress them. Others, and in particular one of the Roman Catholics of the party, were critical and remained so. This is not inconsistent: they were looking at different things.

On reading their different accounts I found that I could confirm almost every word, whether they were describing the standards of living (many actual figures being given for prices and wages), the impressive reconstruction in the towns, or the restrictions on religious teaching as distinct from religious services. Occasionally their comments are a little naive. They place on record their appreciation of the freedom with which they were allowed to broadcast, but without saying—perhaps they did not know—whether they were in fact broadcasting to Russia or to Britain.

The other two books here reviewed are quite different from the first in style. They are better written, and they give a great deal of factual information about conditions in the Soviet Union which is useful and which needs to be known. The Carters' book† in particular deserves to be widely read. But I think that it would make more impression, and indeed do more good to the Soviet Union, if it recog-

*RUSSIA—THE TRUTH. Official Report of the Elected Delegation of Trade Unionists to the USSR, 1951. Illustrated. (*British Workers' Delegation*, 36 Spencer Street, London, E.C.1. 1/-.)

†WE SAW SOCIALISM. By Charlotte and Dyson Carter. (*Canadian-Soviet Friendship Society*, Toronto, 50 cents.)

nised, for example, that the anti-Soviet propaganda to be found in the Canadian press (of which they rightly complain) finds a counterpart in anti-Western trends in the Soviet press, and if they had not themselves apparently spent so much of their time telling the Soviet people what is wrong with Canada.

Iqbal Singh's book‡ leaves an unpleasant taste; this is a pity, for he can write well. But phrases like "the Western intelligentsia, who see nothing funny in waxing sentimental about the births, copulations and deaths of imbecile royalties" occur with the regularity of an obsession; and it is so obvious that for him the Soviet Union can do nothing wrong and the West can do nothing right, that his judgments will be largely discounted except by those who already agree with him. The Soviet Union, in fact, is sometimes worst served by its best friends.

KATHLEEN LONSDALE.

[**Editorial Note:** *The ANGLO-SOVIET JOURNAL counts itself privileged to print the assessment of these books by so eminent a contributor as Prof. Lonsdale. Nevertheless, it appears to us that she is not quite fair to Mr. Iqbal Singh's lively account of some diverse and interesting experiences. In particular she seems to leave out of the reckoning the very special impressions left by a visit to the Soviet Union upon a writer from a great country which still bears, only too painfully, the fresh wounds of recent colonial status.—* Editor, ANGLO-SOVIET JOURNAL.]

‡REPORT ON RUSSIA. By Iqbal Singh (Kutub Publishers Ltd., Bombay Rs.3/8.)

TWELVE IN ONE

IT is a thousand pities that R. de Bray's *Guide to the Slavonic Languages** has had to cost even more than Entwistle and Morison's *Russian and the Slavonic Languages*, published two years ago, for it is on the whole a more useful book. However, one may reflect that for 70/- one is getting an account of twelve languages, which works out at a mere 5/10 a language.

Unlike Entwistle and Morison, Mr. de Bray's primary object is not to trace the history of the Slavonic languages, but to enable the student to read and understand each of them in its modern form. And this one could undoubtedly do, with the aid, where necessary, of a dictionary, after studying the relevant section. Some texts to begin with are provided with each language; apart from this, there are no exercises, the plan being not a graduated

primer but a systematic description of the features and differentia of each language, so that the learning of one can be based on previous knowledge of another.

"This book", says the introduction, "is an attempt to simplify the task of learning the Slavonic languages as a group for those who know one of them already", and the student might indeed be well advised to have learnt one, actively as well as passively, before coming to this book. The one he is most likely to have learnt is Russian (in which case the "Word Order with Enclitics" will be found particularly useful), but the book is equally well designed for having begun with any other. At the same time, the book may be recommended to general students knowing no Slavonic who wish to get a clearer and fuller picture of the Slavonic languages than that given by Entwistle and Morison.

Mr. de Bray brings to his exacting task the deep understanding and love for the Slavonic peoples which we who know him personally have always felt in his teaching. There is none of the seeing through a glass darkly that one detects at times in Entwistle and Morison, the glass being the mediation of cultures and scholarships traditionally hostile to the Slavs. To quote from Mr. de Bray's succinct historical introductions to each language: "One can safely say that the fine traditions of the nineteenth century . . . are being maintained under the Soviet regime today"; "the heroic resistance of the Russian people in the recent titanic struggle has proved their title to greatness"; Polish literature "shows no signs of dying in the newly resurrected and nationally more homogeneous Poland of the present day." And some of those who claim to interpret Russia and Eastern Europe to the West might take to heart the words "even an accurate translation, if it is torn from its context and background, can be totally misleading and distort the truth".

Let it not be thought, however, that the concentration is all on the language and literature of today. If anything, one might criticise the choice of texts (which are not dated) for giving insufficient place to the contemporary, but as a whole, the account is quite right to put the modern language in its historical setting. To facilitate historical comparison, the first language treated is Old Slavonic, the dead language of religious texts, the nearest to the original "Common Slav". This section is unfortunately very short, not explaining all points arising in the texts given, e.g. the use of the letter *ja'* for *ja*. It is, however, commendable for the concision and clarity it introduces into the first published grammar in English of this essential language. (On p. 6, points 6 and 8 could have been better formulated as loss of closed syllables.)

Other languages treated for the first time in English are Byelorussian, Lusatian,

*GUIDE TO THE SLAVONIC LANGUAGES. By R. G. A. de Bray. (*Dent*, 70/-).

Slovenian and Macedonian; and besides the greater attention given to other neglected languages like Ukrainian, particularly welcome, for example, is the clear account of pronunciation in Polish. It is only to be regretted that the general representation of pronunciation relies too much upon dubious English parallels, a bad case being (pp. 28, 29) "ear" for Russian *e oboroimoe*, contrast page 687 for Lusatian *ž*. One would also have liked a generalisation to all the living languages with mobile accent, of the procedure followed with Slovenian of giving one text accented by a native scholar.

Points not explained with complete clarity are the etymological distribution of *l, l', lj* in Macedonian (pp. 250, 258); the conditions of the Macedonian change of *kh* to *v* (pp. 251, 257, 287); the distinctions in Bulgarian (if we ignore dialect, as does the use of "Bulgarian" elsewhere [p. 1] to contrast with Macedonian) between "Renarrative", Assertive (not given as a separate category from Aorist Renarrative), and Renarrative of Assertive ("Pluperfect of Renarration") [pp. 229, 230]. There seems a contradiction between the accounts of Slovak *l* on pages 517 and 522. The reduction of unstressed vowels in Bulgarian is stated to be vulgar (p. 198) without mentioning the accepted pronunciation of unstressed *o* as *u* after gutturals. It is implied (p. 323) that Bulgarian has not *u* for *iat* after hushing consonants, and (p. 649) that impersonal reflexive exists only in Polish (cf. Lusatian, page 743, also popular Czech). Russian masculine plurals in *-u* are derived from Duals (p. 40) without mentioning the possible influence of Indo-European collectives (cf. Latin *locus, loca*). It is said that Slovak had equal rights with Czech (p. 55) without mentioning that since 1945 it has received more substantial equality. The possibly implicit argument from Scots against Kashubian being a separate language (p. 601) could equally well be an argument for Scots being one. Following tradition, the "Frequentative" (and "Double Frequentative", p. 491) formation is classed (e.g. xxvi, 53) as an "Aspect" parallel to Perfective and Imperfective, instead of an "*Aktionsart*" subdivision of Imperfective; but the partial avoidance of the confusing term Iterative is to be applauded.

Some misprints: page 37, for "bull, beef" read "beef, ox"; page 58, for "principle parts", read "principal parts"; page 318, for "vria" read "vira".

Such criticisms of detail, of course, do not in the least detract from the fact that this work, a dozen languages covered by one writer, is a colossal achievement, on which Mr. de Bray is to be most warmly congratulated.

J. ELLIS

LABOUR PRIDE

THIS novel* of wartime construction far from the front line of actual fighting so absorbs the reader that he really experiences the keen sense of competition and personal pride felt by the workers and technicians on the job. From beginning to end it is a story of strong and emotional human endeavour. The almost impossible task of forcing nature to give up to human need and progress part of her hitherto unquestioned territory, coupled with the inexorable time-limit inside which the job has to be completed, becomes a struggle that involves man and man as well as man and nature.

To attempt in the compass of a novel (even a three-volume one) to cover such a story of man's superiority over nature, and of the ever-present struggle against superstition among the local hunting tribe, and also of the stranglehold of accepted standards among engineers, is a formidable task indeed.

Among the difficulties described, perhaps the greatest obstacle of all to overcome was the natural desire of all able-bodied men and women to get to the fighting lines. It was hard for them to accept the reasoning that the front line was wherever one's ability could do most good, not necessarily where one wished to be. In *Far from Moscow* one is aware of reading about intensely human people doing a hard but necessary job, while their country is fighting for its existence.

The separation of a young husband from his wife, of parents from children, of friends from friends, during a terrible and decisive war, is no unfamiliar experience to many people today; but it is one which, when shared, does much to draw people together regardless of all other differences.

The staff working on this tremendous project—which was the laying of a pipeline in a Far-Eastern part of Russia which was not only undeveloped but also to a great extent unexplored—started with many misgivings and not a few confirmed doubts; but gradually they realised that they were, though geographically remote from the battle scene, essential to the war effort. This knowledge raised morale; hardships and privations became easier to bear, until no one doubted the outcome, and only the insistent time factor was the enemy. The project becomes the battlefield, with blasting charges instead of bombs and welders instead of riflemen.

On finishing the book the reader feels a share in the sense of achievement of all these workers, not only in laying a pipeline in the Arctic but in the deepening of patriotic feeling and broadening of outlook that comes from work and interest shared by an ordinary human community.

*FAR FROM MOSCOW. By V. Azhacv.
(Collet's, 3 vols. 12/6.)

No one did the job alone: it was only by co-operative effort that it should be accomplished.

Novels like *Far from Moscow* do a great deal to create for us a real picture of everyday life in the Soviet Union, where literature, and especially fiction, is very closely related to the present mood and future aims of the people. A recent article in *Bolshevik* (14, 1951) on the new tasks of Soviet literature shows clearly that the stress, in literature as in life, is now being placed on the rapid advance towards a communist social structure based on abundance. In that advance the people are consciously creating a new social morality, a new outlook on work as a social responsibility, a feeling of the moral compulsion on the individual to give of his best for the community. As the level of industrialisation and mechanisation rises, old standards and estimates have to be revised, labour habits that have become static have to be revived. This creates personal conflicts, but such conflicts, in a society in which every production advance benefits the people as a whole, can readily be resolved.

Far from Moscow has been called "naïve"; it is "naïve" as fresh air may be after the atmosphere of a stuffy room. The author is not to blame if its fresh and tonic spirit seems unfamiliar to some.

MAVIS FRY

TURGENEV REISSUED

IT is not our intention, in reviewing these five novels,* to examine Miss Garnett's skill as a translator in any detail. Translations are always imperfect, for—as the French say—if they are faithful they are not beautiful, and if they are beautiful they are not faithful. The great virtue of the Garnett translations is that, although her knowledge of the Russian language is occasionally faulty, her English is direct, simple and very readable. She therefore succeeds in carrying over more of the real spirit of Turgenev than do those translations which, while more satisfying from a narrowly scholastic point of view, distract the reader's attention by stylistic inadequacies.

Turgenev's novels have a great affinity to Galsworthy's *Forsyte Saga*, though Turgenev's approach to his heroes is far more positive than Galsworthy's. Each, at his best, had the power to write novels that are social tracts of considerable importance as well as good imaginative literature. Living in eras of rapid social transition, they both succeed in showing the points of similarity and difference in

following generations of the same family.

Messrs. Heinemann have made a wise selection in choosing for their first reissue these five novels, which give a many-sided view of Turgenev's work. They should ideally be read with some slight knowledge of the nineteenth-century Russian background: for this, the introductory essays to these volumes cannot be recommended.

The House of Gentlefolk and *Smoke†* are slight compared with the others, but they are good reading and tell us many interesting things about the life of the Russian gentry. *Virgin Soil* shows the quandary of intellectuals turned "revolutionary" in their approach to the social problems of the day; the peasant, the person they most wished to help, judged them not by their ideas but by the class they sprang from. *Fathers and Children*, a novel that aroused the fury both of the progressive intellectuals and of the Old Guard of Turgenev's Russia, is a fine study of the attitude of the pre-socialist Russian intellectual. Bazarov, the Nihilist, is, however, not a rounded character: he is a lay figure that Turgenev portrays now in a favourable and now in an unfavourable light. He is as inconsistent as the historical circumstances in which he found himself.

On the Eve,‡ which merits special consideration, is surely an object-lesson in how to write a novel with a social theme. Its whole significance turns on Elena's decision to go on to Bulgaria after her husband's death in Italy. Without this decision, it would have been no more than a well-written love story.

Here in *On the Eve*, more than in any of the other novels, the introductory essay, with Mr. Garnett's entirely unjustified assessment of the relative value of Shubin and Insarov as characters, is annoying.

D.G.F. & M.F.

†See *Anglo-Soviet Journal*, Vol. XI, No. 1, for review of another translation.

‡See *Anglo-Soviet Journal*, Vol. XI, No. 2, for review of another translation.

TWO EXCELLENT CHESS BOOKS

IT is seldom that the chess public is provided with one book as good as either Botvinnik's commentary* or König's history†. That these two should become simultaneously available makes the problem of finding books for presenting to chess-playing friends unexpectedly easy this winter.

Botvinnik's account of one hundred of his own best games must be in the hands of every serious student. Included with the

*ONE HUNDRED SELECTED GAMES.

By M. M. Botvinnik. Translated by S. Garry. (*Macgibbon & Kee*, 18/-.)

†CHESS FROM MORPHY TO BOTWINNICK. By I. König. (*G. Bell & Sons*, 18/6.)

*VIRGIN SOIL (2 Vols.): SMOKE: FATHERS AND CHILDREN: ON THE EVE: THE HOUSE OF GENTLEFOLK. By I. S. Turgenev. Translated by Constance Garnett. New Edition. (*Heinemann*, 8/6 vol.)

games is a most interesting article on the Russian and Soviet schools of chess as well as numerous appendices. The description of the methods of work and training successfully used by the author should be worth the price of the book to any championship aspirant even if it is only the local club tournament which he is intending to win. There is much to be learned also from the aspects of the game emphasised by Soviet masters. "First," says Botvinnik, "I must mention our scientific approach to chess. This implies a realistic attitude to the game and a critical attitude to one's own creative work. This has been exalted into a principle. And so Soviet masters are continually seeking something new, continually exploring new roads in the realm of chess theory and practice." Again, "The systems worked out by Soviet masters are so deep, and they depart so far from the established canons, that at first sight it might seem that they can be refuted easily enough." But they prove to be extremely formidable nevertheless. As one would expect, Botvinnik's notes to games are very clear and objective; an interesting additional feature is his definition of "combination" in chess as "a forced variation with sacrifice."

The book by König justifies its title by describing the development of chess openings over periods of nearly a century with carefully selected examples of master play. The section on the Ruy-Lopez opening starts with Morphy *versus* Löwenthal (1858) and concludes with Keres *versus* Reshevsky (1948) while the section on the English opening begins with a game played in 1843 and ends with one played in 1926. The Russian players are well represented and there is a section on Chigorin's defence. The incorporation of new ideas into technique as years go by is clearly indicated in a scholarly manner.

L. S. PENROSE

RUSSOPHOBIA IN THE 1830s

MR. GLEASON'S title*, though correct, will mislead the casual reader. His study deals entirely with the period from 1791 to 1841, and mainly with the 1830s. It is based on Foreign Office Papers, the Urquhart manuscripts, contemporary newspapers and periodicals and the numerous books and pamphlets on Russia and the alleged Russian danger.

This does not sound wildly interesting, except to specialists, who will find some major i's dotted and t's crossed here. Indeed, the non-specialist reader may safely skip a good deal of the detailed narrative of the book. Yet the issues which

Mr. Gleason raises are too important to be buried in learned reviews, and the author is rightly and obviously aware of their importance.

Briefly, he poses (but does not solve) the apparent paradox of Anglo-Russian relations in the nineteenth century. In spite of widespread "Russophobia", only once in 150 years has Britain actually been at war with Russia, "a record of peace unique in the bellicose annals of the European great powers"; and "in the three primary holocausts of modern times, in which Great Britain alone escaped defeat, her victory thrice depended on the military collaboration of Russia". Mr. Gleason is concerned less with this fact (which Englishmen would do well not to forget), than with another "oddity". The Russophobia which swept government and press purported to be the result of a fear of Russian expansionism: more precisely of a Russian occupation of Constantinople. (Mr. Gleason shows that in the 1830s no responsible official took the threat to India seriously.) But in the period under review no threat to Constantinople existed. It is worth quoting the book at some length:

"(Russia's) statesmen concluded that Russia's interests would be served best by the preservation of a weak Turkey . . . which would deny the control of the Straits to some other, potentially less friendly power. All this is demonstrated by the evidence of the Russian archives. It is also apparent that Russia's purposes were frequently and honestly imparted to British statesmen and made known to the British press. In neither quarter were the Russian assurances accepted without serious reservations and frequently they were wholly discounted. . . . Why were Russia's protestations not accorded at least a suspension of disbelief?

"The problem is sharpened by the fact that during much of the period . . . Great Britain's policy was, in the main, more provocative than Russia's. British nationals laboured in the Balkans, in the Caucasus, in Afghanistan and Persia, as well as in Constantinople, Syria and Egypt, far more efficaciously than their Russian counterparts, and it was the British, not the Russian sphere of influence which advanced. British statesmen insisted that their aims were defensive, but had the Russians appealed to the criterion of deeds rather than words . . . an impartial judge must probably have rendered a verdict in their favour." (pp. 2, 3.)

Mr. Gleason is to be thanked for reminding us how easy it is to camouflage expansionism as fear of someone else's expansion (or the disintegration of empire as a foreign plot); and that the almost unanimous opinion of press and politicians has been known to be wrong, especially on Russian affairs. 1951 might well remember the 1830s in this respect. On

*THE GENESIS OF RUSSOPHOBIA IN GREAT BRITAIN: A Study of the Interaction of Policy and Opinion. By J. H. Gleason. (Harvard University Press & Oxford University Press, \$5 or 32/6.)

the other hand it would be dangerous to press the parallel too far. The political situation is fundamentally different today. After 1815 Tsarism, the "gendarme of Europe", stood between rickety monarchs and corrupt aristocracies and the people, from Naples and the Rhine eastwards; today the comparable regimes are propped up by the U.S.A. (which was then the most democratic of countries, though internationally inactive), while patriots and democrats look towards the USSR as then they did towards a revolutionary France. Indeed, Mr. Gleason seems to me to have missed the main characteristic of the official British Russophobia of the 1830s. Whig ministers, whose purpose was to maintain the *status quo* (except where this did not suit British expansion) were from time to time able to make use of democratic public opinion, whose purpose was to win freedom and independence for European peoples. Since Whig and democrat aims did not coincide, the former time and again betrayed the latter—as in the rapprochement with Tsarism of 1839-41. The author, who mistakenly believes Whig Britain to have been "a democracy", does not make this distinction very clearly. Nevertheless, for the reader who avoids drawing facile and mechanical historical parallels, the book is well worth looking at.

E. J. HORSBAWM

CONSIDERING THE EVIDENCE

NOTHING more powerfully prevents the spread of understanding about the Soviet Union in Britain than the extraordinary and never-failing crop of misconceptions about Soviet policy which are constantly passing into circulation. These stories are, perhaps, all the more effective because there is seldom any attempt to support them with serious evidence: they arise, they are transmitted by large sections of the press, and, just because they are presented in this way as self-evident truths which require no proof, they are accepted by millions of shrewd and well-meaning people who in their everyday life have learned to take nothing for granted.

Mr. Pritt in his little book* examines a number of those tales now most commonly believed, and shows how void of foundation they are once the evidence really is examined. Among others, he deals with the stories that the Soviet Union has disrupted the United Nations by her use of the "veto," has prevented international agreement on the atom bomb, is piling up arms with the intention of making aggressive war on America or Western Europe and that millions of Russians are held in slave-labour camps.

Probably few readers of the *ANGLO-SOVIET JOURNAL* believe any of these stories: pretty certainly all of them have

***RUSSIA IS FOR PEACE.** By D. N. Pritt, K.C. (Lawrence & Wishart, 2/6.)

friends who do believe them, and in any such cases Mr. Pritt's book should be of the utmost value. He writes, as he says in his Introduction:

"as an old supporter of friendship with Russia, who has studied that country and believed in it in good times and bad; who has been correct in his judgment of it very often; and who is fortified by recent first-hand experience.

"I feel justified in asking: read this, please, with an open mind; see what I write, and what is actually happening in the world; and then make up your mind. If you see that Russia, far from planning war, is intent on maintaining peace, you may take hope for your future and the future of your children; and we may save our country from a Third World War."

The *Soviet News* booklet† gives additional evidence for reaching the same conclusion. It contains short statements from twenty-nine delegates of nine different countries who visited the Soviet Union last May. Many of them, no doubt, had previously accepted the kind of stories with which Mr. Pritt deals: without exception they came away convinced of one thing at least, that *Russia is for Peace*.

A.L.M.

†**WE HAVE LEARNED THE TRUTH ABOUT THE SOVIET UNION.** (*Soviet News*, 6d.)

JOURNEY OF THE SELF-RIGHTEOUS

THE NUS Delegation's Report* is a somewhat pretentious document, containing sections dealing with such varied subjects as Soviet Government, Legal System, Leadership and Local Government—though no mention is made of the Construction and Irrigation Projects, which constitute a major influence upon all aspects of contemporary Soviet life. Out of a total of 65 pages, some 20 are devoted to "the process of Higher Education", the investigation of which was the delegation's "prime purpose". It is this section that I shall consider here, since its approach and technique are characteristic.

If it is studied carefully, many significant facts emerge. The high proportion of students per head of the population indicated by the figure of 840,000 (not 800,000) full-time students in Institutions of University standard and the high proportion of students receiving grants (over 95 per cent) are two such facts.

But the treatment tends to be superficial (two lines for fees, half a page for grants) and there are a number of omissions. We are told that teachers' children are exempt from fee payment, but not, curiously

***BRITISH STUDENTS VISIT THE SOVIET UNION** (*National Union of Students*, 2/-.)

enough, that many other groups, including for example all students from Central Asia, are also exempt. There are also some inaccuracies—the maximum basic student grant is 600 roubles per month, not 400.

It is unfortunate also that parts of the Report are characterised by an unctuous self-righteousness which, because it completely fails—indeed, does not attempt—to appreciate the nature and purposes of Soviet society, produces a crop of carping criticism which merely reveals the cramped and narrow outlook of the authors. One can but regret that they were unable to take advantage of the advice of the more recent Quaker Mission to Moscow—"to recognise what is good in its [the Soviet Union's] aspirations and achievements" and "to avoid self-righteousness".

DENNIS G. OGDEN

GORKY FOR BEGINNERS IN RUSSIAN

THE inclusion of Gorky in *Methuen's Russian Readers** deserves a warm welcome, and no doubt there will be many a student of Russian who will be grateful for the opportunity of reading, and for being helped to understand and enjoy, Gorky in the original. For—and this fact needs hardly mentioning—even the best translation would not be capable of fully rendering Gorky's unusual forcefulness of writing, from which every figure, every little incident, emerges in relief on the canvas of the humanity he describes.

Gorky's literary greatness needs no comment, but it may not yet be fully realised outside Russia what a great contribution he has made by his writings towards the understanding and assessment of historical events in Russia of the last fifty years or so. Therefore the knowledge of Gorky, best attained through reading in the original, should be valuable alike to those interested in the study of Russian as such and to those studying contemporary history.

These two stories well illustrate Gorky's great and generous-hearted interest in children. *Ilya's Childhood* gives the first impressions of a boy brought from a remote village to a large town, while *Children* is a tale of courage and endurance on the part of a small child. Both are excellent reading books to supplement formal lessons in Russian.

The "Vocabulary" and the "Notes on the Text" in particular are helpful and encouraging for those still unable to read Russian without a dictionary. With barely one or two debatable exceptions the explanations and translations are throughout correct and thoughtful and should be instrumental in helping to approach the spirit of Gorky's colloquial idiomatic Russian, and pave the way to further independent reading in Russian.

*ILYA'S CHILDHOOD, & CHILDREN.
By M. Gorky. (*Methuen*, 3/-.)

It will be surprising if this appearance of Gorky in *Methuen's Readers* is not followed by a demand for more of Gorky's writings to be put at the disposal of beginners and students in this way.

G. ADAM

THE DIPLOMAT

THE appearance of a third impression of the outstanding English novel of the last few years is very warmly to be welcomed. The subject-matter and theme of *The Diplomat* are not, of course, solely or specifically of Anglo-Soviet interest, but Soviet diplomacy and foreign policy nevertheless come frequently within its scope, and Mr. Aldridge's absorbing and impressive treatment of his complex material cannot fail to interest and please readers of this journal. Since its first appearance, events in Persia have made the book more topical than ever, and those who read it on publication might find a special interest in re-reading it in the light of later happenings. It would, however, be unfair to the author to imply that the book is a kind of tract: it is a fine and exciting novel, particularly notable for a satisfying depth and completeness in the development and growth of its characters, who are truly living people, and for a very fine sense of atmosphere: Mr. Aldridge conveys the "feel" of a place or a situation brilliantly.

S.J.

THE DIPLOMAT. By James Aldridge.
(*The Bodley Head*, 15/-.)

The WORLD CHESS CHAMPIONSHIP

1951: Botvinnik v. Bronstein

by

W. Winter & R. G. Wade

An eye-witness account of the great Moscow match with the full scoreboard and complete annotation and analysis. This is preceded by a history of World Championship Chess and biographical notes on the careers of the contestants.

INTRODUCTION BY L. S. PENROSE

4 plates

15s.

TURNSTILE PRESS

PUBLICATIONS RECEIVED

BOOKS

- BIBLIOGRAPHY OF SLAVIC PHILOLOGY. Ed. W. E. Harkins. (*King's Crown Press*, 5/-.)
- CRIME AND PUNISHMENT. By F. Dostoyevsky, tr. D. Magarshack. (*Penguin Classics*, 5/-.)
- DIARY OF A SCOUNDREL. By A. N. Ostrovsky. (*French*, 5/-.)
- DOSTOEVSKY. By C. M. Woodhouse. (*Barker*, 8/6.)
- GEOGRAPHY OF THE USSR. By T. Shabad. (*Geoffrey Cumberlege*, 42/-.)
- JUSTICE IN RUSSIA. By Harold J. Berman. (*Harvard University Press and Geoffrey Cumberlege*, \$4.75 or 31/6.)
- KASHMIR AND THE CONSPIRACY AGAINST PEACE. By R. Krishen. (*People's Publishing House, Bombay*, 5/-.)
- PETER AND THE WOLF. By S. Prokofiev. (*Faber*, 8/6.)
- QUE VIVA MEXICO! By S. M. Eisenstein. (*Vision*, 15/-.)
- RUSSIA'S SOVIET ECONOMY. By H. Schwartz. (*Cape*, 36/-.)
- RUSSIAN ALPHABET AND PHONETICS. By L. Stilman. (*Columbia University Press and Oxford University Press*, 5/-.)
- RUSSIAN VERBS OF MOTION: Going, Carrying, Leading. By Leon Stilman. (*Columbia University Press and Geoffrey Cumberlege*, 8/-.)
- SELECTED SHORT STORIES. By A. Chekov. In Russian. Ed. E. A. Birkett and G. Struve. (*Oxford University Press*, 15/-.)
- SIX SHORT STORIES. By R. A. Domar. Russian Reading Texts. (*King's Crown Press and Oxford University Press*, 10/-.)
- THE EASTERN ZONE AND SOVIET POLICY IN GERMANY 1945-1950. By J. P. Nettl. (*Oxford University Press*, 21/-.)
- THE RUSSIAN FOLK EPOS in CZECH LITERATURE. By W. E. Harking. (*King's Crown Press and Geoffrey Cumberlege*, 24/-.)
- THE SOVIETS IN WORLD AFFAIRS. By Louis Fischer. Reprint. (*Princeton University Press and Geoffrey Cumberlege*, \$10.00 or 63/-.)
- THREE FAMOUS PLAYS. By I. Turgenev. (*Duckworth*, 10/6.)
- THREE PLAYS. By A. Chehov, tr. E. Fen. (*Penguin Classics*, 2/6.)
- WORLD CHESS CHAMPIONSHIP 1951. By W. Winter and G. Wade. (*Turnstile Press*, 15/-.)

PAMPHLETS

- ARTICLES ON TOLSTOY. By V. I. Lenin. (*FLPH and Collet's*, 6d.)
- EAST-WEST SPORT RELATIONS. By Ivor Montagu. (*National Peace Committee*, 1/-.)
- FESTIVAL OF YOUTH. (*British Youth Festival Committee*, 3d.)
- REPORT OF THE FRIENDS' MISSION TO RUSSIA. (*Society of Friends*, unpriced.)
- REPORT ON THE LYSENKO CONTROVERSY. (*Association of Scientific Workers*, 1/-.)
- SHVERNIK REPLIES TO TRUMAN. (*Soviet News*, 1d.)

JOURNALS

- MASSES AND MAINSTREAM, Sept., Oct., and Nov. 1951. (*New Century Publishers*, 35 cents each.)
- NEW WORLD REVIEW, Nov. 1951. (*SRT Publications*, 25 cents.)
- POLITICAL AFFAIRS, Sept., Oct., and Nov. 1951. (*New Century Publishers*, 25 cents each.)
- SOVIET STUDIES, Vol. III, No. 2, Oct. 1951. (*Blackwell*, 9/-.)
- TREES AND THE NEW EARTH, Spring and Autumn, 1951. (*Men of the Trees*, unpriced.)

SCR DUPLICATED DOCUMENTS

RECENT ADDITIONS

(The prices in brackets are those for SCR members)

- Arc. Bib. **Soviet Archaeology 1946-1950: Bibliography** ... 1/- (6d.)
- Ed. 8. **Some Reflections on Pre-School Education.** (Extracts from speech by RSFSR Minister of Education. From *Doshkolnoye Vospitaniye*, 1951, 2) ... 1/- (6d.)
- Ed. 9. **Recent work of the Institute of Education in the Arts.** (From *Sov. Pedagogika*, 1951, 9) ... 2d. (1d.)
- F.S. Nov. 1951 1. **Some outstanding Soviet feature films of 1951.**
2. **Soviet script-writing.** 3. **Films for children** ... 1/- (6d.)
- Leg. 19-21. 1. **Reports from the Office of the USSR Attorney-General on measures to ensure proper application of the law.** 2. **The Soviet Procurator's Office** ... 1/6 (1/-)
- Leg. 22. **Tort Actions** (Supreme Court of the Ukrainian SSSR). (From *Sots. Zakonnost*, 1950, 2) ... 1/6 (1/-)
- Lep. 1. **The Development of Living Processes in the Pre-Cellular Period.** By O. B. Lepeshinskaya. (*Izv. Ak. Nauk, Biological Series*, 1950, 5) ... 3/6 (2/6)
- Lep. 2. **The Development of Biological Structures in Avian Albumen.** By O. P. Lepeshinskaya. (*Izv. Ak. Nauk, Biological Series*, 1950, 5) ... 3/- (2/-)
- Lep. 3. **The Phenomena of Crystallisation in Living Matter.** By M. V. Korosotova and O. B. Lepeshinskaya. A popular scientific article. (From *Nauka i Zhizn*, 1946, 7) ... 2/- (1/3)
- Mus. 9. **Notes on Opera on Contemporary Themes.** By D. B. Kabalevsky. (From *Literaturnaya Gazeta*, 1951, 88) ... 1/6 (1/-)
- Mus. 10. **Music News from the SCR.** (Nov. 1951) ... 9d. (6d.)
- Psy. 5. **Basic Tasks of Soviet Psychological Science.** By B. G. Ananiev. A lecture delivered 27.10.50 ... 3/- (2/-)

**Full lists of the English translations and digests available
in duplicated form may be obtained on request.**

SCR NOTES

AUTUMN 1951 has been a particularly active time for the Society, both in the public events arranged in London and in the preparation of expanded activity throughout the country. Perhaps the London picture can best be given through a list of the meetings and events (at 14 Kensington Square, unless otherwise stated) :

- Aug. 23—*An Architect in the USSR, 1951*. F. W. B. Charles, B.Arch., A.R.I.B.A. Chair : Arthur Ling. (**Architecture Group**.)
- .. 25—Garden party to meet members of SCR delegation to USSR.
- .. 27—Tape-recording recital : Shostakovich, *1st Ballet Suite* ; Myaskovsky, *27th Symphony* ; Prokofiev, *On Guard for Peace*. (**Music Section**.)
- Sept. 20—*1934 and 1951*. Prof. H. Levy on two visits to the USSR. Chair : Dennis Ogden.
- .. 24—Tape-recording recital : *Songs and Chamber Music*. (**Music Section**.)
- .. 25—*Questions and Answers on Soviet Education*. V. Mayevsky. Chair : Mrs. Beatrice King. (**Education Section**.)
- .. 27—*Medical Visitors to the USSR*. Dr. Horace Joules, Dr. Ian Gilliland, Dr. Mary Barber. Chair : A. W. L. Kessel, F.R.C.S. (**Medical Committee**.)
- Oct. 2—Film : *Mussorgsky*. At 18 Kensington Palace Gardens, by courtesy of the Soviet Embassy. (**Film and Music Sections**.)
- .. 9—*The Health of the Soviet School Child*. Dr. Ian Gilliland. (**Education Section**.)
- .. 10—Films : *My Universities*, etc. At Crown Theatre. (**Students' Group**.)
- .. 16—*Soviet Film Strips* : a display of specimens on Geography and Current Affairs. (**Education Section**.)
- .. 21—*The Magic Pipe*. Reading of children's play by V. Voisky. Producer : Donald Bisset. (**Theatre Section**.)
- .. 29—Tape-recording recital : *Song of the Forests*, etc. Discussion led by Malcolm Rayment. (**Music Section**.)
- .. 31—Films : *Jubilee and Marriage*, etc. At Crown Theatre. (**Students' Group**.)
- Nov. 1—*The World Chess Championship, Moscow, 1951*. R. G. Wade. Chair : Prof. L. S. Penrose. (**Chess Section**.)
- .. 13—*The Place of Science in Soviet Education*. Prof. H. Levy. Chair : Prof. L. S. Penrose. At the Institute of Education, University of London. (**Education Section**.)
- .. 16—*Some Aspects of Biological Research in the USSR, 1941-1951*. Dr. Alan Morton, Dr. R. Trim, Dr. D. Ross, D. Newth and Prof. J. D. Bernal, F.R.S. Chair : Dr. S. M. Manton, F.R.S. At the Anatomy Theatre, University College. (**Science Section**.)
- .. 19—**Reception** to Prof. V. I. Kemenov and other members of the Soviet delegation, to meet members of the SCR Section Committees.
- .. 21—Films : *Lermontov*, etc. At Crown Theatre. (**Students' Group**.)
- .. 22—*Soviet Archaeology*. Prof. V. Gordon Childe. Chair : William Watson. (**History Committee**.)
- .. 24—*Questions and Answers on Soviet Literature and Writers*. Boris Polevoi. Chair : Alick West. (**Writers' Group**.)
- .. 26—Operatic tape-recordings : lecture-recital by Lawrence Collingwood. Chair : Harold Rosenthal. (**Music Section**.)
- .. 28—**Annual General Meeting**, followed by illustrated talk by Dr. S. M. Manton, F.R.S., on her recent visit to the USSR.

THE SOCIETY had the great pleasure of giving assistance in providing interpreters and in many other ways to members of the Soviet delegation who visited Britain in November as guests of the *British-Soviet Friendship Society*. Arrangements were made for Professor Vladimir Kemenov, leader of the delegation, to visit museums and art galleries, and to address a meeting of the *Institute of Contemporary Arts* on November 26.

By arrangement with the Students' Union, Mr. Polevoi addressed the students of the *School of Slavonic Studies*, and at the request of the *Authors' World Peace Appeal* he was entertained to lunch by members of the Committee.

Madame Kazantseva, the Soviet singer, and Mr. Valter, the pianist, were similarly entertained by the *Musicians' Organisation for Peace*.

The Society very much regretted that Madame Murashkina was unable, through ill health, to address the meeting arranged by the students of the Architectural Association on the reconstruction of Stalingrad, and that Mr. Polevoi, for the same reason, was unable to address the Students' Union of the *London School of Economics*.

PROVINCIAL ACTIVITIES

IT WAS a happy accident that the beginning of the expansion of SCR activities in the provincial centres coincided with the visit of the Soviet delegation.

Professor Kemenov visited both Oxford and Cambridge, and a number of successful meetings and informal gatherings were arranged by local SCR members for students and staff.

Mr. Boris Polevoi visited Leeds, Manchester and Liverpool, and spoke to meetings at the Universities in all three towns. In Leeds he also met many members of the staff informally, and in Manchester he spoke on Gorky at the beginning of the SCR film show. It was especially fortunate that the newly formed SCR Committees in Leeds and Liverpool were able to entertain Mr. Polevoi as their first public activity. A very successful meeting was organised by the Bradford SCR, at which Mr. Polevoi spoke on the new construction schemes. Mr. Polevoi also had an informal discussion with a group of writers in Bristol.

The Society is very grateful to the Soviet delegation, and to Mr. Polevoi in particular, for the way in which they responded to the numerous requests for meetings and discussions in all parts of the country.

In addition to the activities arranged in connection with the Soviet delegation, SCR groups in the provinces have organised and helped to organise a number of other events : regular meetings and film shows in Bradford and in Oxford ; film shows in Manchester ; meetings and discussions in York ; and so on. Plans are being made for new activities in Sheffield, Liverpool, Leeds and a number of other centres. (See *Future Plans*, below.)

PUBLICATIONS

IN addition to the *ANGLO-SOVIET JOURNAL*, a number of duplicated translations have been issued in the form of Section Bulletins and special papers. This autumn four Bulletins have been issued by the *Legal Section*, two by the *Education Section*, two by the *Music Section*, and one each by the *Architecture Section* and the *Chess Section*. The *Science Section* has issued two further papers on biology and a second paper on Pavlovian physiology; other translations include a 1950 survey paper on psychology and a bibliography on archaeology (See p. 52 for list of titles.)

FUTURE PLANS

IN his address at the Annual General Meeting, Mr. Christopher Freeman, the Society's Organiser, outlined a number of plans for extending the work of the SCR. He stressed the urgency of bringing a knowledge of Soviet science and culture to a much wider audience than has hitherto been reached by the SCR, and suggested four main lines of expansion for 1952:

1. The setting up of local SCR Committees in all the main university centres, to conduct various public activities.
2. The strengthening of the Sections by a recruiting drive, more regular appearance of the Bulletins, and new forms of activity, and the formation of a new Social Science Section. (Mr. Brian Pearce took up his appointment as Social Sciences Librarian in December.)
3. A more systematic effort to get speakers, on various aspects of Soviet life, to a variety of organisations not usually reached by SCR.
4. A special effort to make known the facts about the new construction schemes now in progress in the Soviet Union, starting with a big public meeting and film show at Battersea Town Hall on January 13, 1952.



IN addition to having the pleasure of welcoming Soviet visitors personally, and of regular contact with VOKS, the Society has been able to establish a growing number of contacts with Soviet institutions, such as the Library of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR and the Foreign Commissions of the Union of Soviet Composers and the Union of Soviet Writers.

New Soviet Novels

at 3/- each

for members of the

RUSSIA TODAY BOOK CLUB

The best novels and books of leading Soviet writers are now available to English readers at the astonishingly low price of 3/- post free. You can get these amazing book bargains through the RUSSIA TODAY BOOK CLUB.

Membership of the RUSSIA TODAY BOOK CLUB is open to anyone for 2/6 a year; but we are happy to announce that FREE MEMBERSHIP of the Club has been made available to members of the British Soviet Friendship Society and to members of the Society for Cultural Relations with the USSR.

How to join the Club

- Fill up the form below.
- Send the form to Russia Today Book Club, 36 Spencer Street, London, E.C.1, with a 2/6 postal order if you are not a member of the BSFS or the SCR. If you apply for the free membership of the Club, please make sure you are a paid-up member of your Society.

How to get books

- Read RUSSIA TODAY for news of the forthcoming choice.
- Send a postal order for 3/- to Russia Today Book Club, 36 Spencer Street, London, E.C.1, for the choice of the month. NO BOOKS WILL BE SENT TO MEMBERS UNTIL CASH IS RECEIVED. It will greatly facilitate the administration of the Club if the form below is used. You will receive the choice of the month by post.

The choices to date

November: HAPPINESS, by Pyotr Pavlenko.

December: STEEL AND SLAG, by Vladimir Popov.

January: EARLY JOYS, by Konstantin Fedin.

NOTE: Prospective members may back-date their membership to begin with the November or the December choice.

To RUSSIA TODAY BOOK CLUB

36 SPENCER STREET,
LONDON, E.C.1

Please enrol me as a member of the RUSSIA TODAY BOOK CLUB. I agree to take the next three choices of the Club.

I enclose 2/6 membership fee. I am a paid-up member of the SCR/BSFS.

I wish to receive the	November	HAPPINESS
	December choice	STEEL AND SLAG for which I enclose postal
	January	EARLY JOYS

order for 3/- : 6/- : 9/-.

Name (Mr., Mrs., Miss)
(BLOCK LETTERS)

Address

Strike out what does not apply.

No receipts will be sent unless requested.

SCR CONTENTS LIST SERVICE

The *SCR Library* and the *SCR Translators' Group* have organised a CONTENTS LIST SERVICE that aims at covering as many specialised and cultural journals as possible and ultimately to cover all subjects for information on which a demand exists.

The lists now available cover ECONOMICS, EDUCATION, HISTORY and MUSIC, for periods varying from 1947 to 1952. All four subjects are covered for 1951 onwards.

These Contents Lists indicate the main subjects dealt with in selected Soviet periodicals, and enable those interested to arrange for translations or summaries, through the Translators' Group. The lists appear quarterly, in March, June, September and December; an annual fee of 10/- for the all-subjects service, or 4/- for a single-subject service, is charged.

*Inquiries and suggestions for journals
to be covered should be addressed to:*

**The Librarian, SCR,
14 Kensington Square.
London, W.8**

MASSSES AND MAINSTREAM

**Outstanding
American Cultural
Monthly**

Brings its readers the finest in articles, essays, literary criticism, stories, art, reportage, poetry.

Features American writers like *Herbert Aptheker, W. E. B. Du Bois, Lloyd Brown, Howard Fast, Barbara Giles, Michael Gold, Shirley Graham, John Howard Lawson, Albert Maltz, Paul Robeson, Dalton Trumbo.*

Regularly publishes such international literary figures as *Louis Aragon, Ilya Ehrenburg, Nazim Hikmet, Pablo Neruda, Martin Anderson Nexø, Anna Seghers.*

MASSSES & MAINSTREAM has won enthusiastic supporters in every part of the world. A subscription to *M & M* is something you owe yourself. Why not subscribe today? Only 34/- a year post paid to your address from USA.

**Collet's Subscription Department
40 Great Russell Street, London, W.C.1**

SCR Exhibition Department

The Exhibition Department and Photograph Library supplies visual aids of all kinds—photographs, maps, charts, lantern slides—and large and small exhibitions.



New Exhibitions

CONSTRUCTION OF HYDRO-ELECTRIC STATIONS AND CANALS IN THE USSR (41 *mounted sheets, average size 37in. x 27in., of coloured charts and photographs, showing the great construction projects.*)

THE FIVE-YEAR PLAN 1946-1950 (41 *mounted sheets, average size 37in. x 27in., showing the fulfilment of the Plan in all spheres.*)

THE MOSCOW UNDERGROUND (50 *large sheets, 30in. x 26in.*).

CONSTRUCTION OF LARGE BUILDINGS IN MOSCOW (28 *sheets, 30in. x 24in. and 22in. x 16in.*).

Other Recent Additions

THE WORK OF MICHURIN. Twenty-eight sheets of coloured diagrams, charts and photographs, with translated text.
YOUNG NATURALISTS' CENTRE. Thirty sheets illustrating the work of the Centre, where 600 children spend their free time in practical application of their biology lessons.

EXPERIMENTS OF PAVLOV. Forty-five sheets of photographs and diagrams, with translated text.

THE TRADE UNIONS OF THE USSR.

THIRTY-THIRD ANNIVERSARY OF THE USSR.

LIFE AND WORK OF THE DONBAS MINERS.

BUDYONNY COLLECTIVE FARM (UKRAINE).

MACHINE AND TRACTOR STATIONS IN THE USSR.

THE SOVIET REPUBLICS (sets of forty photographs each, 12in. x 16in.).

(*Average size of photographs, 16in. x 20in.*).

A full catalogue of all visual aid material may be obtained from the Exhibition Department of SCR
